

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York.  
Charles Rosenbaum, of Colorado.  
Miss Frances E. Willis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1960:

##### INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 11: *That the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.*

Most merciful and gracious God, with eager and earnest hearts we are invoking Thy blessing and dedicating ourselves anew unto Thee through the merits and mediations of our Lord and Saviour.

May the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee, His love, His faith, His humility, His compassion be incarnated in us and become the sovereign and supreme reality in the mind and heart of humanity.

We humbly acknowledge that we so frequently fail to embody and express His spirit and do not make vivid and vital the beauty of His life which our character and conduct should reveal.

Grant that in these troublous and bewildered times we may manifest the influence that His spirit has upon us and have the courage to make greater trial of His way of life, trusting Thee as He did, loving our fellow men and seeking their welfare as He always did.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Barden	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Bentley	Hollifield	Rivers, S.C.
Blatnik	Jensen	Short
Buckley	Kearns	Steed
Burdick	Lozier	Taber
Carnahan	Mitchell	Taylor
Durham	Morris, Okla.	Teller
Fisher	Moulder	
Gray	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### SALARY INCREASES FOR POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreements of June 8 and 9, 1960, and clause 4, rule XXVII, I call up motion No. 6, to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 537, providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9883, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman sign the petition?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 10 minutes; and if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] desires time, he will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for having given consideration to the discharge petition. The petition is entirely within the bounds of the rules of the House. It is not uncommon that such a petition be passed by this body. It is a matter of great urgency that this matter be disposed of at the earliest possible moment.

We all know this is going to be a short session. We know, other than over this route that we have taken, that the Members have so graciously helped with, that these long-suffering people, these Federal employees, would not have been given the relief to which they are entitled.

I want to thank the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for having taken up and, in their own judgment, done what should be done to dispose of this matter satisfactorily. I do hope that we will vote on this in the shortest possible time, and that the House will give favorable consideration to the measure so that the other body may act upon it at the earliest date.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman from Kansas yielded 5 minutes

to the gentleman from Iowa. Would that be within his rights?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GROSS. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana particularly wishes to know if he can still yield his remaining 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has control of the remaining time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress some 12 years and I do not recall at any time such high-handed action on the part of a committee as that demonstrated this morning in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service when the Morrison amendment was offered and adopted.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] offered an amendment that makes drastic changes in the pending pay bill. Do not labor under the illusion that the amendment will provide the same bill to which you affixed your signatures on the discharge petition, even with the percentage figure changed from 9 to 7½ percent, because this is not the case. But let the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], who railroaded what amounts to a new bill through the committee, explain the details if he can.

He offered his amendment and then immediately moved the previous question. There was no copy of his bill in my possession in the committee room and it was not until 12:30 that copies were made available on the House floor. This is the first opportunity I have had to read the amendment. There was no explanation whatsoever in the committee until after the vote had been taken which adopted the amendment. Then out of the goodness of the hearts of the majority, members were permitted to ask a few questions.

I reiterate that I have never witnessed more high-handed action on the part of a committee, especially in dealing with a \$700 million bill, and if I am reelected to the next Congress and go back on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service next year I will remember the treatment accorded to some of us today. This method of operation in a committee of Congress is wrong and it is intolerable. It is injurious to the public welfare and does violence to orderly and sane procedure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was the action taken today acceptable to the lobby that put across the signing of the discharge petition?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have heard no complaint from the lobby so far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it acceptable to them now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not ask them. They are not so far away, if the gentleman wants to make inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is one of the biggest pieces of legislative manipulation I have seen in a long while. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held rather long hearings on a proposal whereby certain employees, the greater segment of them in the postal service, if that bill were passed would get about 23 percent. The others would have received from 16 to 15, to 14, down to 10 percent.

The committee held these hearings for quite a while, for several weeks. As a matter of fact, finally, when they closed the doors and considered the matter in executive session, the committee all at once decided by a majority vote to strike out the whole bill and just say in substance "give every employee in the Government a 9-percent increase in salary except for a \$350 minimum for postal and classified workers." That means everybody. It means the folks who work in your office who work on Capitol Hill. If you can find me a Government employee who is not included in the bill, let me know because the chairman himself when I asked him whether certain groups were in the bill, said that he was not sure and he said, "If they are not in, we will put them in." They took care of that. So, as I said a moment ago, there is a 9-percent increase for everybody. Just last Monday, the day before yesterday, I was informed of a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to consider an amendment to the bill because, as you know, this bill does not come in in the regular way. It comes to the floor of the House by a petition which, of course, Members have a right to do and 219 of them signed that petition and said that they wanted this bill considered. So last Monday a meeting was called, or ordered by our chairman to consider, and of course not in writing, a proposed increase to employees of 9 percent or to reduce the 9 percent to 7½ percent. So just a while ago, at 11 o'clock, they came up with the committee print on H.R. 9883 to be offered as a substitute. So this morning the substitute was approved by the committee. I have not had time to read it all. I read a part of it. I tried to get the chairman to read it to us, but there was not the time. So we got around to it and looked the thing over. It may be agreeable to all of you—I do not know. But, the committee changed the 9 percent to 7½ percent and leaving the bulk of postal employees at a little over 8 percent. Then they put in a few extra pieces of legislation. We put in about four or five new employees in the service in the higher grades. When you get through with this bill, you are going to spend something over \$700 million. You are going to get to vote on it up or down, and that is all. If you want it—take it. You cannot amend it at all under the rule.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the committee action this morning do more than change the 9 percent to 7½ percent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes; I think, perhaps, the author of the bill can explain that.

Mr. ARENDS. Certainly, we are entitled to know and we should know what is in the committee amendment. I hope the gentleman who is offering the committee amendment, although he has over the past weeks changed his position many times, will tell us what is in the committee amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Speaking of changing positions, I can also tell you we did not get to vote on the first bill introduced at all when the committee first met in executive session. We did not even discuss the contents of the original bill. The thing was all stricken out except the enacting clause and we wrote a new measure providing for 9 percent across the board.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if it is not true that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois expresses a desire and a right of the House of Representatives, which was denied to the members of the committee this morning, namely, the right to know what was in the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We tried to find that out and it was voted down. We did not get to find out what was in the bill except in a general way. There are a good many changes, and I hope when the time comes the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman, will fully explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, since some remarks at the outset today were directed at me, I wish to state that this legislation was very carefully considered by our full committee for over 6 weeks. We took all due and deliberate time to work out just about every detail that any Member wanted to bring up concerning this bill. We finally reported out a bill providing increases of approximately 9 percent across the board with a \$350 annual minimum for postal and classified employees. That the bill as reported out was the one subject to the discharge petition. The committee voted by a yeas-and-nay vote, and I believe that vote was 17 to 5 when it was voted out of our committee. The discharge petition carried 219 signatures.

A committee meeting was scheduled for today at 11 o'clock. I suggested to the chairman that perhaps it would be better to meet at 10, for I wanted to discuss my amendment fully. I gave the chairman of our committee a copy of my amendment last night, approximately an hour after I had completed it. In the 2 hours of general debate that will be allowed for the consideration of this bill we will discuss it very thoroughly.

At the committee meeting this morning time left, after discussing parliamen-

tary procedure, was too short to allow an adequate discussion of the details of my amendment.

In effect this is what the amendment does, and I will be glad to explain it fully to the membership when we go into debate on it. The amendment that was offered in effect changes the amount of the general increases from 9 percent across the board to approximately 7½ percent across the board with \$5 a year added for each step of the first six postal field service salary levels.

This bill was voted out by a yeas-and-nay vote by our committee this morning. My amendment for 7½ percent was voted by a clear-cut majority of 17 to 4, and the committee worked its will. I am sorry the committee did not have more time to allow me to explain it in detail. Frankly, I think this 7½ percent, taking everything into consideration, is a good, fair, and moderate pay raise that is certainly justified. That the majority of the membership of the House feels that way is evidenced by the fact that 219 Members affixed their names to the discharge petition. They want this bill to come to the floor for debate and to be voted on. I can assure the membership that the full membership of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service did vote on this. They voted on several other motions and they tabled several other amendments. During the whole time I have been here, and, as far as I can ascertain from the beginning of the proceedings of the House, the same rule of the will of the majority has prevailed. The overwhelming majority of our committee voted that they want this amendment for a 7½-percent, across-the-board increase.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. The gentleman has explained what the lowest salaried employee would obtain under this bill; will he please tell us what the highest salaried employee will obtain under this bill?

Mr. MORRISON. It will be a 7½-percent, across-the-board increase with a maximum of \$18,500 for the top classified salary.

Mrs. BLITCH. Has the gentleman figured out the number? I cannot make mathematical calculations that quickly.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know the number of supergrades we have in the Government, but I will be glad to get it for the gentleman. This amendment, in essence, is a straight 7.5 percent across-the-board increase, offered as a substitute for the 9 percent pay raise bill which is the subject of the discharge petition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is in this new bill which is to be offered as a committee amendment, but I am going to talk on the bill that was on the discharge petition and which was the only thing before us up until this hour.

Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason—and there are many—this bill should be



recommitted to the committee for the elimination of that portion which applies to legislative employees.

If there is any group of employees either in or out of Government who are on the whole adequately compensated, it is the employees of Congress, and if there is any place—and again there are many—where there should be selectivity rather than an across-the-board increase, it is among the employees who serve Congress.

I think most Members of Congress are aware, and certainly all of us should be aware of the complicated formula under which the salaries of most of our employees are computed, and this in itself subjects Congress to criticism, if not ridicule. The very idea of starting with a base salary which has been increased by various and sundry devices not less than eight different times, employing flat increases, percentage increases, all predicated upon the gross rather than the base salary, lends itself to a charge of finagling, and there is every basis for the criticism that Congress is trying to confuse, if not mislead, the public in the operation of the legislative branch of the Government. Any further percentage increase would only tend to increase the inequities which now exist.

The very fact that literally hundreds of employees are kept on the payroll, some at substantial salaries, while Congress is not in session and while there are no duties to be performed by many of these employees, is to me a convincing argument that these employees are in an entirely different status from other Government employees.

In the case of employees in congressional offices, as all of you are aware, the pay cannot only be adjusted up or down by the Member, but the employment can even be terminated without notice. The fact that the total amount which can be spent for secretarial and clerical hire in the office of each Member is predicated on the so-called base salaries, is, to say the least, most misleading, and I doubt if there is a Member on this floor today who can tell you both the base and gross salary being paid to the employees in his own office, without referring to the Rube Goldberg formula under which these salaries are computed.

I realize there are many Members who assume the attitude that it is no one's business how we operate the business of Congress, but I would remind you that it is the same taxpayers' dollars that we spend here that we appropriate for other branches of our Government. Economy, efficiency, and, above all, fiscal responsibility should begin here—right here in this House today. Oh, I know someone will attempt to justify his action by what the other body does, and I hear the old song that the public does not get to see the records in the other body. We are responsible for what happens here in the House of Representatives, and it is time that we begin to meet this responsibility.

It will be interesting to hear how some Members will attempt to justify their vote on a bill which will add thousands of dollars to the cost of operating the House of Representatives, when instead

we should be taking steps to reduce the expenses which could be done at a savings at not less than \$5 million a year right here in this body, without affecting the efficiency one iota, and I might add without disrupting any of the practices of an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body.

Many Members have told me that they were not aware that this bill applied to legislative employees. I would say to them that before you vote for this bill you had better find out what all it does include. Other Members have told me that they felt confident that the bill would be vetoed. To me, that is all the more reason why this bill should be re-committed. If we are honest in our desire to provide pay increases where they are justified, let the committee bring out a realistic bill which can be supported enthusiastically and which the President will have no reason to veto. I, too, believe this bill will be vetoed, and I believe the veto would justifiably be sustained, and that is just another reason why I will not vote for it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] and others who are not inclined to favor this increase in salary. I think the majority of this House believes that this increase is justified.

I might also say to the gentleman from Missouri that it is entirely within his discretion what salary he gives his employees. If his employees are not worth the salary they are getting, certainly he should pay them commensurate with the work they do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That does not apply to employees of committees or other employees of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The chairmen of committees can set the salary of committee employees. I say that the people who work in Washington, on the Hill, especially, are the lowest paid employees considering what they do. I am not going to kid myself at all. I depend upon my very competent staff, and I do not believe we could accomplish 50 percent of our work if it were not for the faithful employees we have.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that we do have many faithful employees; but I have two employees in my office who will do more work than five employees in many other offices.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Would the gentleman care to name one?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Name one what?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. One other office where five employees would not do as much as your two.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not going to call names. I am not trying to tell what other people do. I know you have certain opportunities. I have the opportunity to pay the employees what I think they are worth, and I do it, and I am not ashamed of the salaries they are paid.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say in closing that I have been in the public service for 26

years. I have known what it is to live on wages that are much lower than the industrial wages paid during times of inflation. I know that these people suffer great hardships and they could get better jobs on many occasions, but they have seen fit to stay with the Government because they are loyal employees who recognize their responsibilities and discharge them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can pass this resolution immediately.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 537.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker shall recognize Representative James H. Morrison, or Representative John R. Foley, or Representative Joel T. Broyhill, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for consideration of said H.R. 9883, and a Member who is opposed to said bill to be designated by the Speaker; the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except those offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Amendments offered by direction of Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be offered to any part of the bill but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. This special order shall be a continuing order until the bill is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9883, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, in many respects the circumstances under which this legislation is being considered by the House are familiar to most of the Members. As remarked by a Member several years ago, the situation is somewhat like an old movie shown on television. You watch it thinking you have never seen it, but nevertheless you have a strong feeling it has all happened before.

And so it is with this bill, except for one important difference. In my memory, there has never been such uniform and overwhelming support among the Members for salary increases for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, the only question, as I see it, is as to the amount of the increase. As I was explaining to the membership before the adoption of the rule, our committee reported out a bill after 6 weeks of hearings during which either side that wanted to could be heard. We came out with a bill and reported it to the House which called for a 9-percent pay increase straight across the board with a \$350 minimum for the postal field service, rural carriers, and classified workers. That bill as reported to the House was amended today by a committee amendment which will be offered at the proper time. This committee amendment is very simple. In general, it does not do anything to the original bill that was reported out except to change the amount from 9 percent to 7½ percent. It covers all the people who were covered in the original bill as reported by our committee—the bill which was subject to the discharge petition. The change, as I said, is that it cuts the 9 percent straight across the board increase to 7½ percent straight across the board. In some instances, in the postal field service for the first 6 pay levels it gives \$5 a year extra for each of the automatic salary steps.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Was any change made in the minimum amount of the pay raise?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; the minimum of \$350 was taken out completely. There is no minimum of \$350 in the amendment that is to be submitted to the Committee of the Whole at the proper time.

Mr. GARY. Does the bill in addition make permanent the 2½ percent increase we granted last year which will expire on July 1 unless it is made permanent?

Mr. MORRISON. It makes that 2½ percent increase permanent.

Mr. GARY. And the 7½ percent is in addition to the 2½ percent which is made permanent?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that is right.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman referred to some increases in the lower brackets. Was that action designed to take the place of the minimum?

Mr. MORRISON. It does not nearly come up to the \$350 minimum. But in effect it does give the very low-salaried employees a little better than 7½ per-

cent. But I believe in each case it is well below 9 percent, and the slight extra allowance is only for those in the lower grades.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment which was adopted this morning provides for a 5-cent postage stamp.

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. CHELF. Do any of the other amendments that were adopted provide for an increase in the postal rate?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. The 7½ percent is not what the committee voted out at first. Now, to show the interest of the Members of this House in this matter, more than 80 Members introduced pay raise legislation that was considered by our committee. I want the membership to know that every viewpoint on both sides of the aisle, and of all concerned, was considered by the committee. Everybody had his day in court, so to speak, and was permitted to testify before the committee.

I know of no instance, in the nearly 18 years that I have been here, when anybody made a more constructive or substantial or more forceful argument for a pay raise for Federal workers than was made, in our hearings, when comparisons were submitted between Government pay and pay for similar work in private enterprise. In every one of those cases that was cited before our committee it was shown that workers in private industry doing comparable work receive higher salaries than postal and other workers in the Federal Government.

I can further say that the testimony that was brought out showed one example of a newspaper advertisement for people to apply as janitors. Actually they were offering to pay janitors in the larger cities far more money, as starting salaries, than the postal carriers and clerks get who have been working months and years for the Post Office Department.

I can further state in support of this wage increase that the whole weight of testimony that was in favor of it more or less dwelt on the fact that here we are, in this great Nation of ours, not paying our Government workers the fair and just salaries that workers get in similar employment in private enterprise.

I think the committee studied this amendment well. It was adopted by a tremendous majority. I think 17 to 4, which was today's vote, will certainly show that by far the vast majority of the committee that went into detail on this thought that a very excellent case had been made for the proposed salary increase.

All of us know that the time is getting short. We all know we have to be prac-

tical about this. Frankly, I felt that whereas I was personally in favor of the 9 percent, and I still think it was highly justified, this compromise of 7½ percent will be far more acceptable to some of the Members of the House. I am sure the same situation prevails over in the Senate. And so, I felt that by bringing out this amendment today, which will be considered at the proper time, the 7½ percent is certainly the proper thing to do under the circumstances—if we are going to be realistic and practical about this legislation and give the House and the Senate a chance to vote on it and give the President a chance to act on it one way or another.

There were many who said the President would veto any pay-raise bill this year. I do not know what the President is going to do, and I do not think anyone else knows what the President is going to do. But I think when you have this bill as it will be amended today, coming within the time we have before adjournment, it will have an opportunity to go to the White House. If it is signed, that ends it. If it is vetoed, we will have a chance to override that veto.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I congratulate the committee on coming up with this successful compromise. The question is really the amount of the pay raise, not whether there should be one, because if we are going to have the postal and other Government workers move along with private industry we must give some sort of a pay raise at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true most of the wives of the postal workers have to go to work to help support their families?

Mr. MORRISON. The witnesses who testified before us showed us example after example where both the husband and the wife were working. The husband was working for the postal service and the wife had to have another job in order to make ends meet, so to speak.

Mr. HOLLAND. The postal workers had to work at night to supplement their salaries to keep their families.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Quite frankly, in my opinion, increases considerably higher than those in the committee amendment are justified. My original bill so provided. But we all realize, particularly those of us who have served many years in the Congress, that the views of others deserve full consideration. All major legislation more or less represents a compromise as between different convictions, in the highest tradition of our democratic process.

Many of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have put aside their individual preferences in a true spirit of compromise to



bring to the House floor a bill to provide a moderate and fair pay raise which should generally be acceptable.

After careful and diligent study of all evidence developed in the hearings and in full consideration of the many different opinions, the committee decided that the amendment to be proposed represents a solution to which we could all agree. It is a real tribute to the tireless and conscientious work of every committee member that there is such overwhelming committee support for this amendment.

The committee amendment which I will have the honor to offer, which I will place before the House at the proper time, grants a 7.5 percent salary increase, in lieu of 9 percent provided by the reported bill, to all of the groups covered by the reported bill, with the provision, as I stated before, for slightly over 7.5 percent to those in the lower postal levels.

I would also like to call to the attention of the House the cost of this bill compared to what they said my original bill would cost, that is, \$1,600 million. There was a great deal to do about that in our hearings. As I say, the bill that will be before the House for eventual passage after this amendment is presented, and if the committee amendment is adopted, will call for 7.5 percent over-all increases and that will cost between approximately \$680 million and \$700 million. This is the best figure I have been able to obtain from the committee counsel—that is, between \$680 million and \$700 million.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Would the gentleman be willing to support a tax measure or an increase in the postal rates to take care of this increase in expenditures by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORRISON. I am the type of person who crosses a bridge when he comes to it. That question is not before the House today. That is still before the committee. Frankly, I think my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, will agree that we should certainly know what propositions are brought before our committee before we finally act on a bill. I assure him I will try to do justice to myself and to my people, in trying to represent them, and that I will vote according to their wishes. How I will vote I do not know until I have something to vote on.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman realizes, of course, that this will bring us further into deficit financing. Do you not think that somewhere along the line this Congress, and do you not think that you as chief sponsor of this bill, has some responsibility to bring a bill here to pay for it?

Mr. MORRISON. I appreciate the gentleman calling me the chief sponsor, but I have over 79 other gentlemen who are with me on it, and I am not all alone in bringing this legislation before this session of Congress. But as I say, frankly that is not before the House now. I think at the proper time the

House will take up that bill. The committee is just about to wind up action on it. What the committee does and what the House does is a matter on which the gentleman's guess is as good as mine.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I do not want to be unfair to my very able and distinguished friend, but do I understand from what the gentleman is saying that it means the gentleman will in committee support a postal rate increase of some kind?

Mr. MORRISON. I did not say what I would do, and I do not believe I will ever say what I will do before I see the bill that is presented to the committee and before all the amendments come up. Frankly I do not commit myself to my own constituents nor can I commit myself to the gentleman or to any other Member of the House as to what I will do on any proposal, before I have it before me.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. If suggestions are in order, I suggest to the gentleman that the cost of this bill be taken out of the \$4 billion surplus that the President is telling the people of the country we are going to have. Why do we need to raise the postal rates?

Mr. MORRISON. We are not taking up postal rates today; they are not germane and cannot be taken up today. So if the membership will allow me, I would like to explain further the bill and the amendment adopted by the committee this morning.

This increase will affect some 535,000 postal Federal service employees, 980,000 employees under the Classification Act, 8,100 Foreign Service employees, 19,300 employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and 15,000 Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee employees; 5,000 employees in the judicial branch; and 7,500 in the legislative branch.

The amendment contains provisions of the reported bill extending to these employees that I have just enumerated a very moderate pay increase.

I would like to cite some of the effects of this bill as far as the hourly wage is concerned. The average salary of our letter carriers is \$2.23 an hour, or \$370 a month. The committee amendment will increase this by about 17 cents an hour, or \$28 a month. But this is the gross salary increase. This is not the take-home pay, it is not the amount included in his pay check. As I said, it is not take-home pay.

The average letter carrier is one of the finest family men in America. The family, of course, is the basis of our economy and our economic and our social system. The average letter carrier's family consists of husband, wife, and three children, a family of five. From the gross monthly salary of \$370, before the em-

ployee receives anything, there is \$26.64 deducted to pay his fringe benefits, and \$17.17 for Federal and State income taxes. This reduces his monthly take-home pay to \$326 a month, or \$1.96 an hour.

Under the committee amendment his gross monthly salary would be \$398. Deductions would be \$28.64 to pay for his fringe benefits and \$21.89 to pay for the Federal and State income taxes, leaving a net monthly take-home pay of \$347.22, or \$2.09 an hour. Now, this is after this 7½-percent increase is put into effect. In other words, carried down to the fundamental question of take-home pay, the committee amendment would grant an increase of 13 cents an hour in the average take-home pay of a postal letter carrier. This is the additional amount the letter carrier will have with which to buy meat, groceries, and milk, and to buy clothing for his family, to make payments on his mortgages, or whatever he has to do with it.

Certainly it is only fair to grant this moderate salary increase in recognition of the conscientious and efficient public service rendered by our postal employees.

A moment ago I told you about an advertisement that was in a paper. I would like to be specific and quote from this want ad. It appeared in a paper at Detroit, Mich., where many employees in the postal field service work and live. It reads:

Wanted: Janitor for city hall. Examples of work: Sweep, mop, scrub, and polish floors; clean and maintain lavatories, replace light bulbs. Starting salary, \$4,450; \$5,050 after 2 years.

Frankly, I feel that no more need be said to demonstrate that the salary adjustments proposed by the committee amendment are extremely moderate and should be approved and granted to these Federal employees.

Some reference has been made, during our pay deliberations, to fringe benefits for Federal employees—usually by way of implying that they are so liberal that they can take the place of salary. This is a myth. I am proud of the fringe benefits we have been able to gain for Federal employees and am sure that they and their families deeply appreciate these benefits. But they are not to be confused with hard cash in the pay envelope. They are not considered negotiable by shopkeepers or bill collectors or mortgagees. It is much easier to get along with these people when we should show them the color of our money.

Nor are Federal employees' fringe benefits by any means so liberal that they can replace justified pay raises. If anything, they lag further behind similar benefits in private enterprise than is the case with Federal employees' salaries. The Cordiner committee disclosed in 1957 that Federal employees personally contribute more than their fellow workers do in private enterprise for fringe benefits. According to the report, employees of 356 firms covered by one study paid an average of 4.5 percent, and employees of 1,000 firms covered by another study paid only 3.5 percent, of their

salaries for fringe benefits. Federal employees pay 7.2 percent.

Another factor largely overlooked, or given too little weight in the administrative consideration of salary legislation, is the record of productivity by postal and other Federal employees. When postal rate increases or appropriations are being sought, the proponents quite often argue brilliantly and forcefully of improved service and efficiency to justify the rate increases or appropriations. The history is told in glowing terms of a 15 or 17 percent increase in mail volume in recent years, with little or no increase in such man-years of work as are within management control.

In truth and in fact, we all know that this fine record of efficiency is attributable to the performance of more and more work by the 535,000 postal employees. Yet opponents of salary legislation give it no weight at all as justifying pay raises for the very employees who have done the work. The employees are commended indirectly and by words—not by supporting reasonable pay raises in recognition of their efficiency. This failure to give full credit where credit is due in my judgment can become one of the most damaging blind spots in employee-management relationships and in the administrative consideration of salary problems. It tends to create a climate closing off the best avenues of communication and exchange of views between employer and employee—except as a one-way street for the views of the employer.

I strongly urge the Members to vote for the committee amendment providing this 7½ percent pay raise for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his very able presentation today. I am glad that we are going to have an opportunity to vote for a pay raise for Federal employees. I was one of those who introduced a pay raise bill and I was very happy to sign the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the subject. Personally, I feel as does the gentleman, there should be a 9-percent increase. I would like to ask this question: Does not the gentleman agree with me that regardless of what the rates may be for postage the people who are working in the Postal Department should have adequate compensation for the work performed, and that the people working for the Government in other Departments should have adequate compensation for the work performed comparable with what can be obtained in industry?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. MERROW. We are living in an age of constant peril, and every realistic appraisal of the future indicates that this condition will continue for a long time. At the same time, almost every aspect of society and government is growing more complex and is demanding a progressively higher degree of expert-

ness. Under these circumstances, the Government must do everything possible to assure itself of the services of the most competent people.

The questions of employee morale and, even more, of the recruitment and retention of intelligent, imaginative, and experienced employees have long constituted a major problem for the Federal Government. To fail now to adopt this well-merited pay raise will needlessly and unjustifiably intensify this problem.

The pay schedule for the Federal service continues to lag, not only behind the costs of living, but also behind the salary levels being paid in private enterprise. Since the last Government pay raise in 1958, wages in private industry have risen considerably. At the same time, studies in productivity have shown that the increase in work output among Federal employees compares very favorably with that of private industry.

Congress, therefore, has a special moral and legal obligation to investigate the needs of Federal employees and to act promptly to rectify any inequities that may exist. These investigations have now been completed. Both Houses of Congress have held hearings on the question of Federal compensation, and both of these hearings have demonstrated conclusively that a pay raise at this time is both deserved and urgently needed.

The time has now come for action. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to these Federal employees that we can neither ignore nor delegate to anyone else.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman and congratulate him upon the introduction of this bill and for the fine exposition he has made of the subject. Moonlighting among Government employees is something that must be avoided. A man's loyalty should be to his first job, not to his secondary position. Moonlighting is too prevalent at this time, and by "moonlighting" I mean that a Federal employee must secure a second job in order to be able to have an adequate income.

While I am on my feet, I would like to pay my respects to your colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON], who placed this petition on the desk. Whenever the chips are down and the Federal workers need assistance, it seems they go to Louisiana, to you or to Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is a great compliment to the gentleman from Louisiana that he was able to get 219 Members of this House to sign that petition. It indicates the respect in which we hold him and the high position he has earned in the House. During the 8 years Mr. THOMPSON was able to work with people and coordinate efforts. I serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with him and I know the great things he has done for your State of Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] for his very able and intelligent statement made on a very, very important bill.

Mr. Chairman, many post office employees have complained to me, claiming that their postal pay increase bill is being kicked around for personal or partisan or selfish advantage as the countdown toward adjournment begins. They are cynical and bitter for they believe that Congress is only going through the motions.

Much as they resent it, they know where they stand with the President who is flatly opposed to any pay increase for postal workers, and by extension, for all classified employees of the Federal Government, during 1960. But they are suspicious of the legislative maneuvering in the Congress whereby the impression is conveyed that Congress is seeking to ingratiate itself with over 2 million Federal employees for the record, while privately writing off hopes for a pay increase bill at this session.

"It is not enough," the postal employees insist, "for Congress to vote for a pay increase, and then wash their hands of it. What we want to know is whether Congress means business about this, and whether it is prepared to go all the way and vote to override the Presidential veto, before this session adjourns."

That is the issue. From several disillusioning experiences in the past, they have learned much. This time they will be watching, not only the vote for the bill, but the vote to override the President.

For the Congress cannot have it both ways on this bill which is necessary to relieve the economic handicap under which Federal employees must work. The indifference of Government toward the bread and butter problems of its own employees, is undermining their morale and their efficiency. To overcome this lack of understanding and appreciation, it is urgent that the many friends of Federal employees in the Congress should intensify their efforts to line up the commanding support that is necessary to override the veto.

The good faith of the Congress itself is at stake here, for the Federal employees have no recourse but to appeal to us for help. As they compare their lot with the consistently improving pay standards of private industry, they realize that their own position is steadily deteriorating.

We have seen how the United States has lost prestige and power in its relations with the rest of the world through the misleading emphasis on economy, to the detriment of public progress, in recent years. This pennywise conservatism, desperately hugging the status quo, has deprived our Nation of the means necessary to maintain its leadership. At home, this sterile fixation on budget balancing has cramped the progress of Federal employees.

If it were possible for them to transfer their civil service retirement system



credits to coverage under private employment, many would immediately avail themselves of the better opportunities available elsewhere.

As it is, Federal workers are dissatisfied, and rightly so. When they are not paid what they deserve, their job performance is bound to suffer.

To prevent further deterioration we must open the way for an improvement in the wage standards of Federal employees by passing the postal pay raise bill—with votes to spare on this round—and ready to beat the veto.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] on his statement on behalf of his measure providing salary adjustments for certain Federal workers.

As one of those who has supported this legislation all along, has introduced a companion to the original bill, and has signed the discharge petition which brought the bill to the floor, I urge full support for H.R. 9883 on the floor today.

Opponents of the bill say that postal workers have received seven pay raises in the past 15 years, and would have us conclude from this that everything is fine and no new attention to the Federal wage scale is needed. The fact is, however, that seven pay raises in 15 years is in no way out of line, that there has actually been only one pay raise after that granted in 1955 and, most important of all, that the wage of the average post office worker and the average classified employee is still below that of his counterpart in local government or private industry.

In the committee report, on page 5, a comparison of salaries of letter carriers to policemen and firemen in various large cities shows that the former is lower paid in every case. As I testified before the committee, the problem is particularly acute in the city of Oakland, Calif., a major portion of which I represent. In Oakland the automatic salary range for police and firemen ranges from \$6,396 to \$6,828 and this indicates so very clearly that in Oakland the letter carrier's range of \$4,035 to \$4,875 leaves him in a more inequitable position even than elsewhere.

The need for the salary increases provided in H.R. 9883 is clear. They are justified. I urge full support for the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, the other evening I visited a shoestore with my daughters. While the clerk was trying on the shoes, he asked me if anything was being done for his raise. I replied: "What raise?" He said, "The postal workers." I then learned from him after he leaves the post office he is forced to work from 5 until 9 at night

in a shoestore to supplement his income so that he can furnish the necessities of life for his family of five children.

I was quite alarmed to find this was true in many, many cases, and having an office in the Federal building in Pittsburgh, I checked with other workers and learned of their plight in trying to raise an American family. I found postal workers employed in filling stations at night, in garages doing odd jobs, yes—and tending bar in clubs.

Some of these workers spend 16 hours away from their family doing extra work so that they can receive sufficient money to clothe, feed, and house their families.

In many cases, I found that their wives were forced to work as clerks in stores, offices, factories, and restaurants to supplement their husbands' wages.

This is a pitiful case in America where a man is penalized for being a Government worker and denied the pleasure of an enjoyable evening at home with his family like other American families do, who work for private enterprise.

This is a disgraceful condition, and we the Congress of the United States permit it to exist. We who pose before the world as a benevolent government do not show it to our own employees. In this session I have heard about billions of dollars which must be appropriated for peoples of other lands, and to raise their standard of living. I have always supported aid to raise the standard of living in other countries, but I am convinced now that it is time to think of our own, and at least give to our employees the right to enjoy American homelife.

This bill will cost the Government considerably less than what they have appropriated to the peoples of any one country in the world. To hear objections from the administration that a 7½ percent raise is too much for their own employees is an insult to the conscientious and dedicated postal workers of our own country.

The administration has forgotten its own employees too long.

This big business administration seems to be only interested in seeing that the big corporations make higher profits and the banker gets higher interest on the money loaned to the Government's underpaid workers. For the President of the United States to threaten he will veto any raise given to the Government workers is an insult to those who are devoted to Government. In fact, it is the Government workers who are responsible for the efficiency of our Government. You will not find them on the golf course when they have a job to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this bill has been cut to 7½ percent from 9 percent, for I believe that every man and woman working for the Government deserves and earned the 9 percent increase. Let the Members of Congress at least recognize their plight, pay them a decent wage so that the family life so long denied them can be enjoyed in the American way.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, not only support this bill on this vote, but I promise the Government workers of America if it is vetoed by the President I shall vote to override it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, as one of the early signers of discharge petition No. 6, I respectfully urge all the Members here on the floor today to vote for the passage of H.R. 9883, the Federal employees pay increase bill, because these men and women not only deserve this recognition, but are in need of larger paychecks to properly support their families. I feel confident we have the votes to overwhelmingly pass this bill and I am hoping the President will not veto it.

Inasmuch as the Congress plans to adjourn early in July, I further respectfully request that additional bills be scheduled for debate that will improve the economic standards of our American families.

An excellent start in this direction would be the passage of my bill, H.R. 5868, to increase the present hourly minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.50. At today's prices, which continue to rise, I cannot conceivably understand or know how a man with a wife and two or three children can properly shelter, clothe, and feed them on a weekly salary of \$40 or \$50. We all know food costs are high and rents in our metropolitan area of Philadelphia are exorbitant for desirable living accommodations.

While it is true you can rent substandard homes and apartments in the \$50 to \$75 price range, the fact remains that the location is usually very undesirable for the raising of a family. What is needed at this time is legislation to provide additional low-cost housing units in Philadelphia and other cities at nominal rentals in well planned communities for those people who have limited budgets and cannot afford to pay high rents. I, therefore, urge you gentlemen to accept the housing bills presented by my committee, which will destroy blighted areas and create communities of comfortable houses and apartments for our middle- and low-income families with adequate school facilities for their children.

Mr. Chairman, millions of children throughout the country today are receiving an inadequate education simply because there are not enough classrooms available for them. In many of our cities and towns these very same children are attending school in split shifts. In these days of the cold war, when we are fighting for our very survival, the education of our children is one of our greatest assets. They will become our leaders of tomorrow and, therefore, we cannot permit them to continue to be crowded into poorly equipped schools.

Another major item in my program for the American family is the need for legislation to provide medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens who, because of restricted pension checks and limited assets, are unable to cope with emergency illnesses. There are several proposals pending before us to give help

to these very deserving citizens and I urge all here today to back my plea for their immediate passage.

I sincerely and honestly believe my program for the betterment of our American way of life is sound in every detail. It is not an expensive giveaway proposal and will benefit every American citizen.

As representatives of these citizens, I am requesting your support of this program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that my opposition to this measure is futile, since the majority of the Members of the House have already signed the discharge petition on this pay legislation. I am opposed to the measure. I think it is not justified and should not be approved. But, of course, it is going to be approved by the House.

Mr. Chairman, let me say something about the conduct of certain lobbyists on this piece of legislation. This morning when I went to the committee room of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had difficulty getting to the room because of the great swarm of lobbyists outside in the hall. There must have been 75 of them. I had to pry my way through to get into my own committee room. And I have never seen such tactics employed as these lobbyists have been using during this fight for the pay bill. I think it is high time for the Members of the Congress to stand up and let these lobbyists know that they are not to be controlled by them, not to be dictated to by them. If we do not, it will be a sorry picture regarding any future pay legislation.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have a national debt of over \$285 billion. We pay \$9.5 billion in interest each year.

Our Federal payroll is over \$13 billion a year, over \$1 billion a month.

In the last 15 years the salaries of Federal employees have been increased a total of 83.6 percent. There have been 8 pay raises in the last 15 years, for Federal employees. Besides, there is no group of employees in private industry that receives the fringe benefits that Federal employees are getting today. These fringe benefits amount in compensation to about 30 percent of their salaries. They have such liberal fringe benefits as life insurance, health insurance, retirement, hospitalization, and medical expenses. This Government has certainly been fair and liberal to our employees.

Mr. Chairman, we have a \$285 billion debt, on which we pay interest each year of \$9.5 billion. It is high time we stopped these reckless expenditures. I say that it is not in keeping with a sense of fiscal responsibility to increase the salaries of these employees today.

I am sorry to see the influence that these postal lobbyists exercise upon certain Members of Congress and particularly upon certain members of my committee. I regret it. I think that unless Congress stands up and lets them know that we will exercise our own judgment, this condition will get worse instead of better. I am sick and tired of the tactics

of these lobbyists. I, for one, have never been controlled by them and do not propose to be controlled by them.

There is little I can say further, because I know this bill is going to pass. I think we are making a mistake. I do not think it should pass. But I do not care to argue the matter any longer. I am strongly opposed to the bill, but I am sure that will not have any effect.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is a realist. I certainly am a realist on this occasion. I have no illusions about what is going to happen to this bill. It will be passed by the House of Representatives today. But I want to tell you that in my opinion, as it is now written and as it will have to be voted upon under this gag rule that was petitioned out, it is not going to become law.

Having said that, I would like to point out that through the years I have been here I have supported pay increases for Federal employees both in the classified and in the postal service. So far as the postal service is concerned I have been concerned about the deficit in the Post Office Department. In the Republican 80th Congress, in which I was privileged to be the majority leader, we gave the employees the greatest single annual increase in pay they had ever had.

But with that pay increase we had a rate increase designed to keep the Post Office Department out of the red as far as we could. What happened in the 80th Congress, as far as pay increases are concerned, has been happening in the Congresses since that time. Increases have been voted from time to time. In 1958 we had a rate increase. In addition, as the gentleman from Tennessee has so well said, fringe benefits have been voted that I understand would amount to about an 18 percent pay increase.

I realize, of course, that everyone would like to have more pay, anyone who works for a living, but when those of us who have the responsibility to fix that rate of pay get ready to do something, everybody would like to be openhanded, but we have a responsibility otherwise. One Member on the other side of the aisle in the interruption of another speaker said:

Take the pay increase out of the proposed surplus.

That is one philosophy of government. But I say to you that we should not go overboard because we have a little surplus that might be applied on the national debt to keep the credit of this country good and to keep us strong here at home.

This bill will add \$700 million a year additional to the cost of our Government. It really has been a strange development, with 20-percent bills introduced, and a 9-percent bill petitioned out under a gag rule with no opportunity to correct things in this bill that I think are glaringly wrong. We are foreclosed from that opportunity.

Referring to the Post Office Department, there is presently a deficit of about \$600 million a year. This bill in

the Department alone will add an estimated \$225 million a year. The author of the bill was asked about the rate increase that has been pending before the committee for a long time and he was reluctant to say what his position on that would be. That is understandable. But the fact is that a proposal for rate increases has been pending before that committee, given to the committee by the President of the United States, for months and months and months, and I have not seen any activity in respect to it and I do not suppose there is going to be any. In other words, the committee has ignored that recommendation, so we will add \$225 million to an already existing deficit of \$600 million.

People talk about the cost of living situation. My understanding is that the cost of living has gone up about 2 percent since we voted the last pay raise. That is not 7.5 percent. Again I want to point out that through the years since certainly about 1953 the cost of living has gone up about 10 percent and the pay increases have averaged out to a total of about 20 percent, and that does not take into account the 18 percent for fringe benefits.

One other point: We appropriated \$500,000, as I understand it, to appoint a commission and to enable that commission to make a study of this whole Federal employee situation and to report back to us. It does seem to me that more attention might have been given to the matter of waiting for a report from that commission.

I said when I started that I did not think this measure would become law. I do not need to tell you that it is not in accord with the President's program. As the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, the administration witnesses before the committee take the position that the circumstances at the time did not justify a pay increase. So I say to you on my individual responsibility, because the President has never committed himself as to what he would do, I have no question in my mind as to what his action will be on this measure if and when it reaches the White House.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to say I respect very highly the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. We have served together in the House for 18 years. There have been many times we have not agreed upon issues, but I want to say in the handling of the committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has always, in my opinion, handled it according to the rules of the House and the rules of the committee. When presented with a parliamentary situation, he has had the honesty, the character, and the integrity to make his rulings in accordance with the House rules or the committee rules, and if they were questioned and appealed, he would abide with the decision of the majority of the committee. The committee was called together this morning at 11 o'clock. Our normal time of meeting is 10 o'clock. The 1 hour that



was given to us was, therefore, from 11 o'clock to 12 o'clock, at which time we had to rise under the rules of the House; the rules do not allow the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to sit while the House is in session, therefore the majority of the committee found it necessary to avail themselves of the rules of the House in order to bring before the House for its consideration the legislation which you have before you. When they did avail themselves of the rules of the House, I must say the chairman responded to those rules and upheld them as he does in most instances, at least in all instances for which I have knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some talk in the well of the House about the lobbyists in the hall outside the committee room. It has been my experience in the Congress that a lobbyist is a person who opposes something you are for, but if he is for something that you are for he becomes either a public relations man or a representative of a friendly group. So all of us have the right to label these men who appear in behalf of the different groups as either lobbyists or public relations men. But I want to point out something to you that I know you know, and that is there are over a million employees classified and postal employees, yes, close to 1,500,000 employees, and they are denied the right of collective bargaining. I am not arguing that point at this time. But they do not have the right to bring the force of collective bargaining to bear for increases in their wages. They must depend upon the Congress of the United States when they want a pay raise. They come to you and to you and to you for an adjustment of their wage scale commensurate with that of people in outside industries who have the right of collective bargaining. Therefore, this Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has a peculiar obligation to see that these people are not left wanting, that they do have their day in court. Today is their day in court, before the Congress of the United States. There has been no move other than that permitted under the rules of the House to bring this subject before you for consideration. You have the responsibility to vote it up or vote it down. I have complete confidence that every Member of this House will act on his own responsibility when the roll is called.

Mr. Chairman, let us see about some of the merits of this case. President Eisenhower appointed committees to study this. He has appointed many committees. The Cordiner Committee was one that studied the rates of pay of these people in Federal employ. This was in 1957. Dust has gathered on that study. Then the O'Connell Committee was appointed. Here is what the O'Connell Committee said:

Salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels.

There is the guts of the situation.

Federal employees' salaries have not been adjusted commensurate with salaries of non-Federal positions. What do

I mean by that? Let us just look at the record.

The average gross monthly salary of a letter carrier is \$370—that is gross salary. When you deduct the fringe benefits and tax deductions he gets \$1.96 an hour—\$1.96 an hour, or \$89 a week; he gets \$89 a week take home pay.

What is the average weekly earnings in industry? In the transportation business it is \$118; in coal production and the petroleum industry, \$116; in printing and publishing, \$105; in machinery, \$105; in chemicals, \$100.84; in electrical machinery, \$92.84; in stone, clay, and glass products, \$91.30.

The average overall industry wage is \$15 a week or \$780 a year higher than that of Federal employees doing the same type of work.

We are before you on this day asking you to do something about this. You can quote figures about the increase in cost of living since the last time they had an increase in the cost of living, but Congress always lags behind in giving Federal employees their wage increases. When we grant this raise we still will not bring them up to the average wage outside of the Federal Government. We always lag behind, and regardless of whether the cost of living has gone up 2 percent or 3 percent since their last raise, they started with an inequitable wage balance to begin with. When we pass this bill today and if it should become law, it would still be behind pay for the same type of work, the same caliber of work in outside industry.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry, please?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In just a moment.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has said to this House that he has private information that this will not become law. We have reduced the 9 percent in the committee bill to 7½ percent. We have tried to compromise as far as we can possibly go in the discharge of our responsibility. If the President vetoes this bill it is his responsibility, and it is the responsibility of those who vote against overriding his veto when it comes back to this House. I want you to know that I for one am going to discharge my responsibility by voting for this measure; and when the bill comes back, if it does come back vetoed, I am going to accept my responsibility again and vote to override the President's veto. There are 1,500,000 families who need a few paltry dollars more to pay their debts, to buy food and medication and the necessities of life. The President can discharge his responsibility, and I will discharge mine.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman knows about a study and report that was made on the salary of postal and classified employees, but can you tell us what report or what study was given to the legislative employees?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The studies were given to the Federal employees outside of the Congress. The responsibility of the Congress is to make that study. If

the gentleman wants such a study made I suggest that he introduce a bill and refer it to the Rules Committee. The House will be glad to consider the matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was just asking if a study had been made.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Not that I know of.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If a study has not been made how can the gentleman determine that a wage increase is needed or desirable for those people?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Living has gone up. If the gentleman does not want to use the increase he can set the wages of his own employees. I may say I am not using all of my allowance for my salaried staff.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Over half of the Members are not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed increase of the salaries of postal and classified employees which is before the House at this time is in my opinion one of the urgent items on our legislative program. It is urgent because any measure which is intended to help men and women to improve their means of livelihood is urgent. It is designed to satisfy human needs and nothing could be of greater material importance.

I am deeply interested in the objectives of the entire bill—H.R. 9883, as it has been amended—I would like to record my support for the benefits it will provide for both postal and classified employees. All are well deserved and I am of the firm belief the bill in its present form should be enacted.

The plight of the postal employees has been ably presented in the hearings and on the floor of this House. An impressive argument can also be advanced for raising the salaries of employees under the Classification Act who are covered by title II of this bill, and I would like to comment on several of the sound arguments which may be advanced in support of an increase of the salaries of classified employees.

The case to be made for this raise is sound. It is in every sense a debt which this Government owes to these employees. The discharge of that debt is overdue and there is no valid reason why it should be further delayed.

This pay raise can be substantiated in many ways. It is not necessary to rely on an emotional appeal or to fall back on fallacious reasoning which misrepresents the real conditions supporting the soundness of this legislation. There is ample factual material available to justify the 9-percent increase provided in this bill, as well as the 7½-percent proposed amendment. I shall in the course of my remarks summarize several of the more meaningful points which can be made in support of this pay raise. Among them are the following:

First. The rate of wage increases has been substantially greater during the last 10 years for employees of large corporations than it has been for Federal classified workers.

Second. The pay for comparable jobs in private industry in many metropolitan

centers is above that of classified employees. Bureau of Labor Statistics data on these areas of heavy concentration of Federal employment are already available. We need not wait for more.

Third. The 9 percent is well supported by the advance in prices and productivity since January 1958, and to a greater degree during the last 10 years.

Fourth. The Federal Government's policy toward its wage board employees is more equitable and realistic.

Fifth. Altogether too great emphasis has been placed on the cost of this pay raise.

Sixth. An annual salary adjustment plan will provide the most desirable solution to this classified salary problem.

Now let us examine these six points in some detail.

First. The rate at which hourly wage rates of employees of some of the largest corporations have been increased during the last decade has been substantially greater than the rate of salary increases for Federal classified employees. To understand the extent to which this has taken place, it must be kept in mind that since 1950 Federal classified salaries were raised 10 percent in 1951, 7½ percent in 1955, and 10 percent in 1958, or a total of 30 percent, if the percentages are compounded. Let me repeat that figure—classified salaries increased 30 percent since 1950. In the last 2 years of that decade, there has been no increase. Now let us see what industry has done.

The hourly rates of employees of General Motors Corp. advanced 62 percent from January 1950 to February 1960. Of this increase 9.5 percent was received since January 1, 1958. During the same 10-year period the United States Steel Corp. raised wages 63 percent and the Aluminum Co. of America, 87 percent. The increase of the Steel Corp. in the last 2 years was 7 percent and of the Aluminum Co. 10 percent—the 2-year period in which the Federal Government has given no increase.

To mention other instances—Firestone and Goodrich Rubber Cos. raised wages 56 percent in 10 years, including 6.8 percent since the beginning of 1958. The increase of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. was nearly 63 percent of which 13.7 percent was in the 2-year period.

These percentages are reliable, for they have been calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Even though they apply to a segment of industry, they have significance because the companies to which they refer represent a total employment of well on to 2 million, the majority of whom were involved in these wage statistics. They were the result of collective bargaining with several of the large unions. These increases in industry include only general increases of pay rates, cost-of-living and similar wage adjustments. They do not include incentive earnings, premium overtime pay, shift differentials or changes in skill level.

Second. Analysis of wage and salary trends in the metropolitan centers plainly indicates that the salaries of Federal classified employees are lagging behind those for comparable jobs in private industry. This disparity in pay is shown by

a comparison of the average earnings of three representative office-type positions surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the average of the comparable grade in the Federal classification salary schedule. The positions compared were stenographer, key punch operator and tabulating machine operator.

In a number of widely scattered cities in which the current BLS survey program has been completed, the average earnings for these positions exceeded the comparable Federal average. This was true of Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, Jersey City, Newark, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. New York and Chicago have not been completed.

Throughout the hearings in both the House and Senate, emphasis was placed on the need to wait for the completion of the current BLS occupational wage surveys. I do not believe that is necessary. There are ample data now available. The 30 metropolitan areas for which final wage data have already been published have a Federal employee population of approximately 750,000 or close to one-third of all Federal employees. Sufficient data are available from many of the remaining 30 metropolitan areas to be completed by September to provide all the significant information needed. The cities which have been added to those previously surveyed are smaller cities and are not representative for purposes of classified salary analysis. Classified employees are to a great extent office clerical and professional employees who are employed in the larger communities. It is unfair and unsound to base the study of their salaries on labor market areas that are not metropolitan in character.

Third. The proposal to raise classified salaries 9 percent is also well justified by the advance that has taken place in consumer prices and productivity since January 1, 1958. The Consumer Price Index of BLS has advanced 3.2 percent from January 1958 to April 1960. If we assume that the postwar average increase in productivity of 3.1 percent a year from 1947 to 1958 has continued, we have the additional factor of a 6.2 percent productivity increase in the private sector of the economy. Thus our basis for urging the proposed salary increase consists of 3.2 percent for the price rise and 6.2 percent for productivity, or a total claim actually in excess of 9 percent.

If we take into account the fact that prices and productivity advanced more than Federal classified salaries from 1950 to 1958, there is even greater justification for a pay raise. During that period there was a combined increase in prices and productivity of 46 percent, but salaries were raised only 30 percent. There was, so to speak, a deficit of 16 percent. If that deficit is added to the increase of more than 9 percent of prices and productivity since 1958, we have an even greater basis for advocating a salary increase, but our 9-percent figure for the most recent 2-year period is sufficient for present practical purposes.

Fourth. There is another phase of the classified salary problem which deserves

attention. It is the inconsistent policy of the Federal Government toward these employees as compared with its attitude toward those who are subject to wage boards. During the last 10 years classified salaries have been adjusted only three times. During that same period there have been annual wage adjustments for the nearly half million blue-collar workers in the Defense Department. Comparing the median hourly rate of a grade W-7 wage board employee with a GS-4 classified salary, the wage board rate increased 62 percent and the comparable classified rate 30 percent during that 10-year period.

On the basis of the same grade W-7 rate, the record shows that it was increased 6 percent in 1957, 5 percent in 1958, and 6 percent in 1959. What happened in these 3 years alone shows the very great inconsistency in the Government's policy. It also indicates that an important reason for wage board employees receiving added increases is that their rates are reviewed annually. And they should be. But why deprive classified employees of the same consideration?

Fifth. And this brings us to the next point of the need for more frequent review of classified salaries. Some method should be devised for making, if possible, an annual review of classified salaries. I believe such a system could be worked out successfully, and certainly it is needed to assure classified workers of the equitable treatment they deserve.

More frequent examination of these salaries would prevent the delay between classified increases—4 years in the case of 1955 pay raise. These delays are unfair to the employee because his rate of pay continues to lose purchasing power. A regular annual review would be administratively desirable for the Government. It would permit annual budgeting of the cost of whatever increase seemed desirable since the preceding year, and if done annually it would probably result in a smaller percentage increase falling within any single year while the employee would receive as much or more money over a given period. And, of course, the important fact is that he would receive it when he needed it—not 3 or 4 years later.

Sixth. There has been altogether too much emphasis on the cost of a classified salary increase. By that I mean that the principal consideration should be whether it is needed. If that can be demonstrated, it should be treated as having at least as much urgency as any other budgetary proposal. The important difference, of course, is that a pay raise has the purpose of helping people, and of greater importance, of helping our own Government employees.

To think first in terms of cost is the wrong approach. We should realize that a 9 percent pay raise will cost a good deal more today than it would have 10 years ago, and it will cost still more 10 years hence, if the price level continues to increase at the same rate. We should be prepared for these exigencies that are the result of economic change.

We should consider this proposal to raise classified salaries first for its benefit to the men and women who are serv-



ing the Government. But that is by no means the sole reason. We should consider it from the standpoint of national dignity and of administrative efficiency for it is upon the capabilities and the loyalty of our Government employees that much of the successful operation of this Government must depend. We cannot in good faith continue to ask the men and women of the career civil service to continue to perform the duties which each year become more exacting and more complex and at the same time refuse to accord them the simple justice of rates of pay which they have earned by any reasonable standard.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion and in the way of a summary I would like to make three additional observations concerning this legislation.

First of all, as well pointed out by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the legislation before us and the committee substitute which is pending is the result of a compromise. There is nothing unusual about that. Very often when we are considering major legislation which is somewhat controversial there always has to be a little give and take. I want to assure the membership of the House that the willingness on the part of us to compromise is not because we did not feel a higher increase was justified, because we know we can justify a higher increase; it was not because we did not desire to grant a higher increase to Federal employees, but it was in recognition of certain political facts of life. We realized we could get a great deal more support from Members for a 7.5-percent increase than we could for a higher amount. We have been reasonably assured that any legislation of this sort will be vetoed. We will certainly need support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House in order to act on a veto when this bill comes back.

My second point is this, and I make it as a statement of fact, and while it is repetitious I use it for emphasis. The Federal Government has not kept up with private industry insofar as the salaries of its employees are concerned. It has not nearly kept up. You can toy with statistics all you want to, but the record of the hearings on this legislation was full of proof in substantiation of my statement.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics presented evidence before the committee showing what the consumer price index was. It is up 113 percent since 1939. The figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that all grades from grade 5 up of Federal employees have not received increases consistent with the increases in the cost of living since 1939. Approximately 60 percent of our classified Federal employees have not received salary increases since 1939 in keeping with the increased cost of living.

Employees of other industries have fared much better than employees of the Federal Government. Since 1950 we have granted increases to Federal employees in an amount of approximately 30 percent. It may be interesting to observe that the employees of major industries of this country have received over twice as much in the way of in-

creases since 1950. General Electric has increased its employees 62 percent since 1950, United States Steel 66 percent, Aluminum Co. of America 87 percent, Firestone and Goodrich Rubber Companies have increased their employees 56 percent, Lockheed Aircraft has increased its employees 63 percent. These major industries employ approximately 2 million people. This shows that the increases have been consistent with the general increases that industries have paid their employees since 1950.

Since 1958 these same industries have increased their employees on an average of 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I had a very interesting personal observation to make in the committee when one of the witnesses pointed out or referred to the increase that the grocery clerks here in the Washington area received as a result of collective bargaining back last January or February. He pointed out that they received a settlement that amounted to \$97 per week. Back in 1937 I worked for the Safeway Grocery Co. for a short time. It was then the Sanitary Grocery or the Piggly-Wiggly Grocery Co. They paid their employees \$23 a week. Since 1937 the Safeway Grocery Co. has increased its employees to \$97, amounting to a 320 percent increase. The postal employees in 1937, during that period, received an average of \$2,038 a year. The postal employees today—I speak primarily of the letter carriers—are receiving an average of \$4,640; in other words, an increase of 123 percent. I do not believe any Member of this body would like to recognize the Safeway Grocery Co. as having better employees or thinking more of the welfare of their employees than the Federal Government—certainly not that many times greater.

Now, the executive branch has recognized that there are inequities existing in our Federal employees pay scale. The minority leader has pointed out they have recommended a study be made. I think that we are all in accord with that. But the study comes too late. They have known that these inequities have existed for years, and they should have taken the initiative several years ago to propose a study and to propose a plan on which the Congress could act to correct these inequities. This is but a partial solution of the problem. After the study is completed we can come back and further improve the situation next year.

My third point is with reference to this estimated cost of \$680 million. I would hate to think that all of us who support this legislation are not as equally concerned about the fiscal condition of this country as those who oppose it. I submit that this instrument we have before us today, this legislation itself, is not in itself what is causing the additional cost of \$680 million. The reason why it is going to cost \$680 million more is because the Federal Government has assumed certain responsibilities and certain obligations as a Federal Government and is rendering certain services to the people of this Nation. Since we have assumed these responsibilities and obligations, it requires the employment

of approximately 2.3 million people. We cannot economize by merely refusing to pay these people a proper salary and a competitive wage. Anybody that has any experience with business, anybody that has had any experience with employee-employer relationships knows that you cannot economize in your business by the blood and sweat of your employees. To those who are stressing fiscal responsibility today I say if you want to economize, then we can reduce some of these Federal services or eliminate some of these Federal responsibilities that we have assumed. We can eliminate some of the Federal agencies. Certainly we can employ better manpower utilization. Incidentally, the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been holding continuous hearings on manpower utilization to try and improve and get more effective use of our personnel. This argument that this pay increase is too costly has been used in every proposal during the past 10 years, and yet I do not believe any of the previous opponents will say today that we should not have granted those previous increases, because even after granting those previous increases, we are still very far behind. I predict that in the future, after we have granted this pay increase, the opponents here today will then recognize and might even acknowledge that this increase was necessary. We cannot overlook the increase in efficiency and morale and the improvement in our competitive position with other industries by acting favorably on this legislation today. This is a reasonable, a fair bill. As I stated before, it is the result of a compromise, a good compromise. I hope it will receive the overwhelming support and approval of the membership in order to insure that when the bill comes back up here, if it is vetoed, we will have the necessary votes to override the veto.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883. This pay increase for Federal classified and postal employees is very much needed. The Federal Wage Board or blue-collar employees in the San Francisco area of California have received increases totaling 11 percent in the last 18 months. These increases were 5.1 percent in December 1958, and 5.9 percent in December 1959. However, the Federal classified and postal employees have received no increases during the same period. As a result, numerous classified employees in the San Francisco area are receiving lower salaries than wage-board employees who are working under their supervision. This is highly undesirable from a morale or administrative standpoint. H.R. 9883 will aid in correcting this situation. I think this bill is worthwhile and very much needed. I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Along with a few minority members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and including the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member, I have been fighting a steamroller today and for a

number of days past. I have no complaint about that. I have no quarrel with it, although I think some of the tactics of the steamroller reflect on the legislative processes of this country and of this Congress. I hope the American people will know as a result of this debate a little bit more about the system by which we juggle a \$90 million percentage point of increase and kick it around when at the very same time there is a major scandal in the press, an effort to create the impression of a scandal, because of a \$90 expense account. But I have no complaint about the fact I am in a minority.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9883, and before I go further let me say that I have voted for the two pay raises for postal employees that became law since I have been in Congress. I voted for one of the two classified pay raises that became law. And I hope, if I am here for some years to come, to vote for some more. But I am opposed to H.R. 9883.

I realize that I need to be a little bit more explicit, because there have been a number of 9883's kicking around this House and in the committee.

I oppose the newborn, minutes-old form, this so-called 7½-percent bill, as it comes to us this afternoon direct from the committee delivery room after a very violent Caesarean operation, and with it still red-faced and squalling, wrapped in swaddling clothes. I oppose this newest legislative offspring just as I opposed the original, H.R. 9883, which was greatly ballyhooed prenatally, and which was subsequently disowned and orphaned by its own parent or parents; they claim some 80 fathers to the bill. And I oppose this newest H.R. 9883 exactly as I opposed the offspring that came to this House under this discharge petition, which had a very short life, which was abandoned in the desert of committee reconsideration and left to gasp out its last breath all alone.

So let the record be clear that I am opposed to this bill. Now I am done with the obstruscular metaphors and I want to say some things in very blunt language. In doing so I address myself, Mr. Chairman, not so much to my colleagues here where the die is cast, but I address myself to the people of this country, to the taxpayers and to the Federal employees themselves, the two innocent bystanders in this tragedy-farce.

First of all this entire legislative undertaking has been an attempt to find out how much the traffic would bear and just how many political friends and votes could be picked up in the process of finding out how much the traffic would bear.

This is an attempt at successive, well directed, well engineered—and not all of the engineering and direction has come from within the Congress—a well directed and engineered attempt to retreat by successive steps to an ultimate victory of some sort.

I have great respect and regard for my friend from Louisiana and I do not criticize in the slightest his right to do what he did, but according to a report appearing in the publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers

during a big super pay rally that was held here in Washington the first week of April, the gentleman is described as having said that he would fight to the limit to secure the passage of this bill, that is, the 12-percent and 23-percent bill. But even before the committee had completed its hearings the gentleman was asked by the chairman of the committee:

You do not seriously insist on the 23 percent?

And his answer was:

No, sir.

There was never a motion made by this gentleman in his own behalf or in behalf of these other gallant sponsors of this bill; there was never a motion made in committee to vote out this bill or even give it consideration in the executive session.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Did the committee consider restricting the increase to salaries of \$7,000 or less?

Mr. JOHANSEN. No, the committee did not, principally because the committee under the legislative principle that has been followed has not had a chance to consider very much of anything.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman believe that salaries of \$15,000, \$16,000, or more should have this increase?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The persons up to the highest level in the classified service get the straight 7½ percent.

I will say in further response to the gentleman, and this goes to my second point, this is an election year, something for everybody on the Federal payroll bill. I will say to the gentleman that even the efforts of the minority in the committee to get separate consideration on the floor of this House in separate bills as between the postal employees and the classified received the same steamroller treatment as was given the entire effort on the part of the minority opposition to the bill.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to go further and say this, the President of the United States immediately after the last 10-percent pay increase, at a time when the pay issue was not before the Congress, at a time when no one in good faith could accuse him of stalling tactics, recommended a Hoover Commission type of study to go into this whole program of Federal pay policy and pay procedure. That recommendation was repeated twice thereafter by the President of the United States.

I want to report to this House that on this very morning, as a member of the committee, the recommendation of the President of the United States was offered by the gentleman from Michigan as an amendment, and I will say to the committee that the recommendation of the President of the United States received considerably less courteous consideration than have the recommendations of some of the presidents of some of the organizations who represent the

employees, and, of course, have a perfect right to do so.

I want to point out a third fact about this whole situation. This legislation involves the one kind of book burning which the liberals are in favor of and practice with great enthusiasm. I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is on the floor or not, but I call your attention to the fact that on the 3d of June when we saw the spectacle of this House being enlisted in cooperation with the effort to secure the 219 signatures, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] said, and I quote him accurately, I think, that:

When it comes to human need I would never find the answer in a book of arithmetic.

I respect the gentleman's right to that view.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course I will.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. He quoted me correctly. Does the gentleman disagree? Does the gentleman contend that human needs should be left to the mathematical calculation of cold hearts?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would be very glad if the gentleman would permit me, but let me complete what I was saying and I think that will answer the gentleman. Let me say this, that I know of no sure way in which we can assure that this country, the people of this country, and the employees of this Government will know a more crucial and desperate need, I know of no sure guarantee that that will happen than if we continue persistently in this country to ignore and fail to find the answers in a book of arithmetic.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I cannot yield further.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman has mentioned my name. Is he afraid?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is the gentleman implying that I am afraid?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois would never question the courage of his good friend, the gentleman from Michigan. But, on general principle, I take it that any man who does not want to yield after mentioning my name is afraid to face the issue. I, of course, would respect both the sincerity of his conviction and his caution in retreat.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will be very glad to yield if the gentleman will make it very clear that he does not think the gentleman from Michigan is afraid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I particularly thank the ranking minority



Member on our side for granting me this time, because I am sure he knows that most reluctantly, most regretfully, but in my case most necessarily, I am going to take a position opposite to his, on this legislation. I am going to vote for this bill. And because it is so exceptional a rarity for me not to support fully the position of the administration on fiscal matters, and because I think my position parallels that of many in this House who share my constant concern for sound fiscal policy, I would like in 2 brief minutes to tell you why I am so voting. I am voting for this bill, Mr. Chairman, because this is the only avenue given to me after all the 17½ months of this Congress wherein I can keep not a spoken pledge but certainly an assurance that I gave to those Government workers in my own district whom I know to be deprived of what they need to live decently, particularly the many in the lower grades, without taking extra jobs and without having their wives also working outside the home to obtain a necessary supplementary income. I have made a personal study of the family budgets and salaries of the classified workers and the postal workers in the 13th District over the period of the last 4 years. I speak from definite knowledge of the inadequacies of the salaries and the subsequent unsalutary effect upon both the service itself and upon the morale and actual physical well-being of those who are attempting to raise families on inadequate salaries—or are forced to supplement those salaries to the extent of having a second position of their own and/or additional work outside the home on the part of the wife and mother. The difficulty of obtaining and of retaining trained workers has become increasingly difficult as competition continues to increase through the rapid development of new industries which offer a salary range that cannot fail to attract men of good intent whose first responsibility remains for the welfare of their families.

Aside from the deleterious effect on the service through frequent turnover and disrupted and insufficient service, however, I deplore the additional effect upon the worker himself who must attempt to support his family on a wage which, in our area and similar areas where the cost of living is high, simply cannot meet even the simplest needs of family living.

The area which it is my privilege to represent has an exceptionally high cost of living index. In fact, an analysis of the price index of the entire Chicago area, according to the Consumer Price Index for all items as of January 1960 shows the great extent to which the Chicago area is above the national level.

The annual budgets that have been submitted to me in 1960 by postal workers in the 13th District bear mute but effective testimony to the effect of this high consumer price index on Government workers on low-fixed salaries. Of the budgets so submitted, only 7.5 percent showed any surplus after deducting the cost of basic necessities. Of this 7.5 percent, half of these represented single

men and none within this category had more than two dependents.

Investigation further showed that almost 75 percent of the postal workers whose returns were analyzed were forced to seek additional income in order to meet basic living costs.

Some budgets presented to me showed, despite extreme care and an effort at thrift, a deficit of over \$1,000 per year in meeting just the ordinary expenses of living. In certain post offices there is evidence that certain workers hold, in fact, three part-time jobs in addition to their basic postal work. Past raises in pay have been more than absorbed by the rising cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, were there time, I could quote from letter after letter from Government employees whom I know and trust. These letters attest the inadequacy of present pay, and deplore the effect of that inadequate pay upon both the branch of Government which they serve and pointedly upon their families.

In the face, therefore, of reports which I personally have investigated and know to be true and not exaggerated, I could not possibly deny an increase at this time.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, without taking time to go into the sociologically bad effect on both the community as well as the family involved when a government worker is forced to live on insufficient pay, I would repeat that the present measure offers to me and others in similar circumstances the only avenue through which I can help the Government workers involved to obtain the increase in income which I know they need.

It, therefore, today, cannot be with me just a question of whether this bill is completely right or the plan just as I myself would have sought to make it. It is not just a question of how much I may dislike the "gag rule" for which some of my colleagues condemn the measure. I only know that I cannot possibly refuse to bring to those in my own area, particularly to those in the lower grades, what I think the Government of the United States owes its workers—a living wage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I received a letter from a postal worker which moved me very deeply.

For some time I have been very interested in the first Allied crossing of the Rhine during World War II at Remagen Bridge—which will go down as one of the greatest exploits in American military history. I have followed the record of the heroes of the Remagen Bridge carefully since 1945. I know all of these men like brothers. I have visited with them and eaten at their homes. They correspond with me regularly.

This letter comes from a mail handler in the New York City post office named Anthony L. Samele. Tony Samele is a big, optimistic fellow who married his childhood sweetheart. When Remagen Bridge loomed, he was a squad leader in the point infantry company. Not only did he lead his squad in the precarious

crossing of the bridge, but he helped clean a German machinegun nest out of one of the big towers on the bridge. He was the third man in the American Army to hit the east side of the Rhine on that dramatic day of March 7, 1945. He writes to me:

Everything has not been going too well for me since my Army days. I'll explain, as briefly as possible, to tell you what my life has been like since leaving the Army.

I'm married to a swell girl and have two children. I've been a regular mail handler in the Post Office Department for the past 8 years. My salary is \$4,450. After taking out pension money and taxes, there is hardly much left. I live in three small rooms, with poor heat and ventilation. As my family increased, demands became more and more, and I was forced to borrow, since my earnings were insufficient to cover expenses.

My wife worries about the health of the children and not being a well person to start with she became very sick mentally and physically.

My wife had lost the sight of her right eye at the age of 5 as the result of a bad fall. This week, she was rushed to the Bronx Eye and Ear Hospital for an emergency operation on her other (left) eye. I had taken her to see two eye specialists, and both of them agreed that an operation was the only thing to do or she would be completely blind. It's been 4 days now and we still do not know the outcome. The doctor will not commit himself. As I'm writing this letter to you, I'm hoping and praying that everything will be OK with me.

The doctor wants his money, the hospital wants their money, and me with no hospitalization plan of any kind or money to pay them.

KEN, I have never asked anyone for a favor big or small. I'm no hero. I tried my best for my country when I was in the service. I've tried my best to support and maintain a family. I've never approached anyone for a handout, I don't know how. If it's within your power to help me, I would appreciate it very much and be grateful to you for the rest of my life.

Now, here is one of World War II's outstanding heroes—one of the eight enlisted men to receive a Distinguished Service Cross for his courage. Yes; I will help him, and help thousands of other loyal and hard-working postal employees and I hope the membership will join in supporting H.R. 9883 to give these people a well-deserved raise in their wages. And if the President sees fit to veto this bill, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to discuss issues which are not going to arise. Personally, I should feel some sense of exaltation today because I told you very early in this debate on the salary issue that a 7½-percent increase was approximately correct, and I do congratulate all of those who have extended this necessary and desirable increase for having arrived at a figure which seems to me to be most realistic and which seems to me to be passable.

I think all of us recognize that when these bills do come to the floor including large numbers of people that there can be inequalities, there can be groups covered that should not be covered; there are groups which perhaps did not receive

all they should get; but we should remember that the Congress of the United States is a continuing body and that grievances can be adjusted at all times, corrections can be made when those in charge of a legislative program desire them to be made.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am simply rising here today to state that I am definitely in favor of this bill; that I think over all it is a good bill, that it can become law, and that it can result in necessary increases for all but a few of our employees.

I recognize, as some of you do, that the bill in all its aspects is not exactly as I would like to have it; but under all the circumstances which have prevailed I believe this is a bill which we can support in sincerity and honesty. Where individuals have objections they can go to work to make those objections felt in the year ahead.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I again urge that all of those who have any regard for the majority judgment of this committee which did work long and hard on this bill and which found itself confronted with nothing really new this morning, we all recognized that what has been in the papers, what has been discussed time after time was nothing new, and I do not think those arguments are very valid. No one should have been surprised by what was voted on.

So I am going to support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one remark. This situation proves how ludicrous it is for the Congress to attempt to set salaries. Here in one week the committee reports a 9-percent salary increase, and then in a couple of weeks they report an amendment to 7.5 percent, with no basis in fact whatsoever. Until this Congress gets to a point of putting salaries under the control of a board and making them on a regional basis you will never have justice for the employees in high-cost areas, one of which I represent.

I am certainly sorry to see this spectacle on the part of the House making in one week a 9-percent recommendation and within the next week a 7.5-percent recommendation. It proves just how wrong we are in trying to set salaries on this kind of a basis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before us in a very strange manner. I am very happy that I have been able to be here during the debate. In the committee this morning I heard absolutely nothing about the present bill, H.R. 9883, as amended, in the way of explanation. The gentleman who offered the amendment did not take time to explain it; he did not seem to consider that was at all necessary, although it is my recollection he was enthusiastically in favor of a 9-percent pay raise bill

which was taken from the Speaker's desk by way of discharge petition. I voted for that 9 percent. Of course, I would like to know some good reason besides political reasons, which I think I know, why we should suddenly be brought face to face with a 7.5-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, even the 9 percent was considered highly inadequate by all proponents of this legislation. We started out with 23 percent, then we went slowly and gradually down until finally with tears and groans and ice water in our veins we decided on 9 percent as the very lowest that could be offered. Here we appear with 7.5 percent. How do we explain such a situation? I think there are two ways of explaining it.

First of all, what the gentleman from California has just said is eminently correct. We have shown ourselves as a committee and as a body—that is, the Congress of the United States—to be completely unfit to set wages.

During a colloquy I had with one of the employee representatives I said to him what I would like to say to many of the proponents of the present bill, not the original 9 percent—that this is the finest argument I have ever heard in my life for private enterprise.

We have been told how wonderfully the great corporations treat their employees as compared with the U.S. Government, and I agree with that 100 percent. So I said to this gentleman:

How would you feel about doing what the late John Wanamaker suggested many years ago? He said, "I will be very happy to take over the postal service of the United States. I will run it efficiently, I will have no trouble with my employees, and I will make money out of it."

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation, and I think it is a situation that we had better consider very seriously.

We get ourselves into this hassle, Mr. Chairman, to my certain knowledge, at least every 2 years and usually once a year. It is never a satisfactory solution. Everything we do is always too little and too late, and this is going to be much too little and much too late.

Some time ago I offered an amendment to this bill in the nature of an escalator clause, such as has been used very successfully in private industry. That would not be considered because, of course, we know perfectly well that the leaders of the employee groups do not want anything that would automatically take care of their people, so that they would be perfectly well off and would not have to come in year after year with this kind of a compromise bill which, apparently, we all agree is quite inadequate and insufficient.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe in the committee system and I believe in our system of government. And, I must say here and now that if we are to be governed by discharge petitions, I would suggest that we go right ahead on that basis; that we send the Congress of the United States back to other occupations for which they would probably be better fitted and that we leave this matter entirely in the hands of pressure groups and the Executive. But, this is certainly not what we, when we took our oath of

office, believed we were doing. This is certainly not what I, when I first came to this Congress, expected to be called upon to do. I expected to work in committee, to understand what was being brought out of committee, not to have things shouted through the committee; not to have them brought out on the floor unexplained. Why, this bill was never on our desk in the committee until 11 o'clock this morning. I understand that some members of the committee did have copies last night. I understand that one member of the committee did not even have a copy this morning. This is no way to legislate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to be able to support a pay raise bill on behalf of postal workers who do not have the flexibility in their pay structure that is provided classified employees. I had hoped to be able to support a reasonable increase for postal fieldworkers, particularly in the lower brackets, but I am not going to be given that opportunity. I offered a motion in committee when the 9-percent bill was considered to separate postal field workers from title II of the bill, which brought in all other employees. My motion was defeated. I cannot support a 7½-percent increase across the board for all employees of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] say that this is fair and reasonable legislation. Well, if it is, what label did they put upon their 23-percent bill and then their 9-percent bill? If this is fair and reasonable, what label did you put on those bills? Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the leader of this movement, when hearings were held before our committee on the foreign service pay section of this bill?

Mr. MORRISON. Is the gentleman yielding to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am trying to get an answer to my question.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, it so happens that the chairman of the committee was conducting the hearings, and he conducted all the hearings, so I think the question should be addressed to him.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman attended the hearings on his own bill he must have known whether any witnesses appeared to justify an increase in pay for all foreign service employees.

Does the gentleman know or does he not know?

Mr. MORRISON. I was not there every minute of the time. It is possible that testimony could have been had when I was not there. All I did was introduce the bill which was considered by the committee. The chairman of the committee had control of the time, as to when witnesses would be heard who were for the bill and when witnesses would be heard who were against the bill. I am sure the gentleman has the same access to that information as I have.



Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can say whether they were there without going into a speech.

Mr. MORRISON. I am sure the gentleman knows as much as I do about who testified and who did not testify.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows, if he attended the committee hearings, that not a single witness appeared on behalf of the State Department in behalf of a pay raise for all Foreign Service employees.

I would like to ask the staff member for the committee who is sitting next to the gentleman from Louisiana to answer the question, but I am sure that would be a violation of the rules of the House.

Does the gentleman know when hearings were held on the 25 supergrades that were put into this overnight bill? When were hearings held to justify the 25 supergrades that the gentleman has in the amendment he offered this morning?

Mr. MORRISON. That does not create 25 supergrades. It merely re-allocates existing supergrade positions. The cost of title II not over \$40,000 a year. And I might add that this is one thing in this bill that President Eisenhower wants, because that is what he requested. I am very hopeful that by giving him what he wants—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech in behalf of the President of the United States. I doubt very much that the President approves this bill. But I cannot recall a single witness appearing before our committee in behalf of 25 more supergrades, nor do I remember a single witness appearing before our committee this year in behalf of a new \$19,000 pay-bah in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If any member of the committee knows when any witnesses appeared before the committee to justify these high priced employees, I wish they would tell me. I do not know who dreamed this up. I assume it was dreamed up along with some more of the stuff that was dreamed up last night and rammed through the committee this morning.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is it not obvious that the reason why there were no hearings on these items is because these items were never in the bill until the amendment was put before us today?

Mr. GROSS. And yet they put a batch of supergrades in this bill and gave them nice, fat increases; supergrades calling for up to \$18,500 a year. Under the terms of this bill they will get somewhere around a \$1,000-a-year increase, some of them more.

But what is the increase for the 349,939 postal field service employees in level 4? Can the gentleman from Louisiana tell me how much he proposes to increase the top step in that level, while he is proposing to increase these supergrades and others by \$1,000 to \$1,200 a year? By how much is he going to increase these postal workers?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman has asked me a question which may be

rather confusing. I wish to say that there are no more supergrades created. There are just 25 supergrades reallocated. Several other jobs are increased, at a cost of less than \$40,000 a year and which the administration asked for. As far as the increases in the class to which the gentleman is referring, if he will get out his paper and pencil, he can get the answer by taking their present salary and increasing it by 7½ percent.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is the author of this bill and he ought to be able to tell me what the increase is in the top bracket of the supergrades, as well as the highest increase to be given in level 4 where there are almost 350,000 postal employees.

Mr. MORRISON. The answer is very simple, 7½ percent.

Mr. GROSS. You bet your life, 7½ percent. You give several hundred superdooper employees an increase of \$1,000 a year or more while a level 4 postal worker gets around \$300 a year or less; is not that correct?

I might add that it appears the amendment will increase the pay of secretaries to Senators to \$17,500 a year or an increase of about \$1,000 a year. Can it be that these employees and others are suffering far worse than other workers trying to support families on \$5,000 and \$6,000 per year?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Can the gentleman tell the House how much this committee amendment is going to cost the Government annually?

Mr. GROSS. I saw it for the first time when I arrived on the House floor this afternoon.

Mr. MEADER. Has any estimate been made about that?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman will yield, I can answer that. It is slightly under \$700 million, or between \$680 million and \$700 million. It is \$150 million less than the 9 percent bill which was the basis of the discharge petition.

Mr. MEADER. Will the gentleman give me the source of that \$680 million figure?

Mr. MORRISON. The committee counsel.

Mr. MEADER. It was not made by the Budget Bureau, as was the estimate on the original bill? Is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. GROSS. The bill we are actually considering at this time is a 9 percent bill. What we are talking about in dealing with the 7.5 percent increase is the amendment railroaded through the committee that may or may not be adopted. I assume it will be. But what we are actually dealing with at this moment is a 9 percent increase, not 7.5 percent. That is the bill that the discharge petition went to, and then they walked off and left it as they did with the 23 percent increase on which all the hearings were held.

My objection to this bill is that it goes across the board. It gives to those who least need the increase the greatest increase, compounding the inequities that already exist, and with no opportunity

or disposition to correct these inequities. That is why this bill is so wrong and why I cannot support it.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 9883, as amended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As a member of the committee, I had an opportunity to hear and to review all of the testimony offered during the extensive hearings on this legislation, and as a result of those hearings can only conclude that the increase provided in the bill before us is completely justified.

It should be obvious to anyone that postal and Federal employee wages have not kept pace with wages paid in private industry in the past 20 years. Despite this condition, those who oppose this legislation ask that we wait another year to take any action so that a study now in process may be completed. In view of the studies that have been made in recent years, particularly the study by the administration-sponsored O'Connell Committee, whose report, to my knowledge, has never been published, I am forced to conclude that this problem has already been studied to death. In the report of the O'Connell Committee, it is readily admitted that "Salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels." In the face of that conclusion—a conclusion upon which the administration took no action—I have no reason to believe that the study now being conducted would have any result.

Further, I think we should recognize that the current study, which has been rather widely described as a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is not what it seems. In the first place, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is simply making a survey of white collar wages. For a number of years the Bureau has been making a study of white collar wages in some 20 areas, and is extending that survey to an additional 60 metropolitan areas. Once the figures are gathered, the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission, and not the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are going to make comparisons of the wages paid to postal and other employees in thousands of different positions.

Personally, I have no hope that either the Post Office Department or the Civil Service Commission will arrive at any conclusions as a result of the survey greatly different from those expressed to our committee. Since the survey is limited to about 29 white collar positions, 23 of which are commonly filled by women or girls in private industry, it is hardly likely that it will provide information upon which anyone could logically or fairly determine a comparable wage for post office clerks and letter carriers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics already has all the figures anyone would need to determine what a fair wage

should be, and witnesses appearing before our committee demonstrated by means of these figures that since July 1951, average industrial wages have been increased approximately 70 cents per hour or 45 percent, while postal employee salaries have increased only 38½ cents per hour or 19 percent. To me this is sufficient evidence that there is an immediate need for postal and Federal employee salary increases. For that reason, as a member of the committee, I supported the majority opinion which is now before us.

My position is perhaps best summed up by a statement made by one of the witnesses appearing before our committee, Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, who presented facts which clearly demonstrated that—

First. Postal wage increases have lagged more than 25 percent behind wage increases granted in private industry since 1951.

Second. The productivity of post office clerks has continued to increase which in itself warrants salary increases.

Third. The administration by its part in the settlement of the steel dispute stands committed to further wage increases in private industry.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the bill now before us. I hope that the President will approve this legislation. If he does not, I shall certainly vote to override a veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], a member of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to know that the administration has requested additional supergrades. Also increases in the upper levels. In past years when we had given an increase across the board, the result was to narrow the wage level difference between the upper and lower grades, bringing about a serious inequity in the salary structure and violating the accepted principle of equal pay for equal work and responsibility.

A further point I want to mention here is that the last Federal Pay Act of 1958 which amounted to an increase of 10 percent created a considerable amount of new purchasing power. The pay increase we are considering at the present time increases the purchasing power of the American public about \$2 billion a year in terms of the gross national income.

The purchasing power of the American public is going down. We have unemployment in various sections of the country. This will be a stimulant to our national economy.

But disregarding that, the equity of this measure is that the Federal employee as such is in need of an increase in his take-home pay, so as to bring him closer to industry in the high cost of living area in which most reside.

Also, although the Postmaster has given us figures that they have a large number of applications requesting jobs in the Post Office Department, those are in areas where unemployment is high, like Detroit, and some in the low-cost-of-

living areas where there is a large demand for postal jobs.

I hope the committee will act favorably upon this legislation. In order to keep good well-trained employees in the employ of the Federal Government we have to give them a fair salary commensurate with the work they do.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], asked this question. On page 2 of the committee report the budget figure of the 9-percent raise was \$846,306,500. That is on a 9-percent basis. If you take off 1½ percent of that, which is one-sixth of it, you take off approximately \$141 million. Then there was another adjustment downward which amounted to about \$8 million. So in round figures, and I am only giving round figures, the difference between this bill, and it is just as statistically justified as was the figure of \$846 million because it is based on that figure, is about \$150 million less than the 9-percent figure which was given to us by the Civil Service Commission and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LESINSKI. In other words, the gentleman from California is saying that the figures presented have been substantially verified by the Commission. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, in order to be plain I have first outlined my points in favor of this legislation for the postal workers and Federal employees' pay raise.

First. This pay raise will not unbalance the Federal budget nor cause a deficit.

Second. Twenty-five percent of this pay raise will come back to the Government in taxes.

Third. Our U.S. economy of \$500 billion of gross national product this year must be a balanced economy, giving due regard to necessities of our working people, as well as the production of luxuries. We in America should stop starving our community services and provide adequately for the workers who provide these necessary basic services.

Fourth. Government employment should be a model for other employers and employees in our U.S. economy. Government employment and Government employees should not be continued as another chronic depressed area. Whether or not Government employment is officially designated as a chronic depressed area, it certainly carries the general public reputation.

Fifth. There is no doubt about the efficiency and loyalty of our American people working in the postal service, and in Federal employment. But there is and continues to be a large turnover of these Government employees which shows the need of a pay raise, and basic dissatisfaction over wages, salaries, fringe benefits, and conditions of employment. This turnover of Government employees is un-

necessary, causes inefficiency, and higher costs to the Government and to the taxpayers.

Sixth. This bill is not inflationary, as the pay raise for Government employees will go to provide the minimum necessities for families, food, clothing, housing, education for children, and transportation.

Seventh. We in Congress have a special responsibility to our U.S. postal workers and Federal employees. We have a tradition in America that adequate pay for a good day's work is an American heritage. Congress has this responsibility for the public employees. Nobody can reasonably argue that the present level of pay is adequate. Recognition should be given to the loyal service given by postal and Federal employees because it is the special concern of the Congress, as the employer who sets the rates for those employees. We in Congress are their employers and the guardians of Federal employment. A fair day's pay for a fair day's work is basic to our U.S. free enterprise system.

Eighth. Congress should see that all groups in our Nation's economy move ahead and progress together. I do not believe that any one group, particularly Federal and postal employees should fall behind. Likewise, if the level of Government employment does fall behind the level of employment of private industry, Government efficiency and Government employees will suffer. Private industry will be in a position of competition that can only be disastrous to employment for necessary public programs. Government employment must therefore compare favorably with employment conditions in private industry.

Ninth. When we have a group that has been as loyal as these U.S. Government employees have been—there have been no strikes and no industrial trouble, and when they have uniformly provided efficient services day and night, we should give such worthy service to our American people, every recognition, and back this pay raise fully. I think the compromise of 7½ percent recommended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is certainly a minimum amount which we should approve promptly.

In conclusion, I urge strong support of the current pay raise bill, H.R. 9883, and recommend adoption of the proposed committee amendment as a compromise to insure action in this session of Congress.

All that our good postal workers and other Federal employees ever have asked of their Government is timely and fair salary provisions. They do not ask for any special or extraordinary treatment, but they rightfully expect not to suffer discrimination.

Review of the record before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented, at the committee hearing on H.R. 9883 and over 80 companion bills, including H.R. 9997, which I introduced on January 27, 1960, that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. I firmly believe that



all groups in our economy should move ahead economically at the same rate, and this pay raise is necessary to meet this test.

A man must receive a full day's pay for a full day's work, whether he works in private industry or the Government. The beneficiaries of this bill, our postal workers and Federal employees, can be no exception.

In the hearings before the committee, representatives of postal and other Federal employees clearly demonstrated that their salaries are well below salaries paid their fellow workers in private enterprise whose levels of responsibility are comparable. These employees proved that their salaries have been, and are today, far behind the U.S. national economy.

The Federal employees who are seen most by the general public, the taxpayers, the citizens of these United States, our fine letter carriers, whose motto, "Neither rain, nor hail, nor snow, nor black of night shall stay these couriers from their appointed rounds," are the direct public representatives of our Government, yet they cannot meet the rising cost of living as well as their neighbor who works in private industry, and cannot educate his child to be the engineer, scientist, or teacher which our Nation now needs.

The time for sympathy is past, the time for action is now. Now is the time to begin the end of this discrimination. Now is the time to vote for the bill, H.R. 9883, with the proposed compromise.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the prompt adoption of the bill and the committee amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I add my voice to those who have spoken in support of H.R. 9883, which would bring a long needed and necessary pay increase to postal and other Federal employees.

I also take this occasion to commend most sincerely the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and those members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their effective work in achieving a breakthrough in a most important area of legislation.

As a cosponsor of the Morrison proposal and as a signer of the discharge petition, I join those who point out that a reasonable increase of 9 percent is preferable to that of 7½ percent. However, although the facts are not on the side of the administration, I certainly realize that the original increase of 9 percent would without doubt incur a Presidential veto.

Additionally, I realize that the amendment calling for a 7½-percent increase should make the bill less vulnerable to a Presidential veto. This amendment has been offered in good faith by reasonable men so that such Presidential action may be stayed, and that the issue may be clarified should a veto unhappily occur.

It may well be that the administration will not assume its responsibility

in approving the amended bill. I do not think this possibility should deter us from approval of the bill. Our responsibility is to act affirmatively since we must not lose sight of the fact that the provisions of H.R. 9883 are needed and needed now.

It would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" to repeat the extensive documentation, made in committee and on this floor during discussion of the sum and substance of the issue, on the practical need to improve the wage standard of our postal and other Federal employees, and the economic feasibility of doing it at this time.

I not only urge passage of this bill, but I urge that it pass so overwhelmingly—in both Houses—that a Presidential veto, if still forthcoming—can be readily overridden, as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the President would like to see the employees of the U.S. Government on a wage level in line with that prevailing in private industry. I would also hope that he join with the supporters of the increase in realizing that the wage structure of our Federal Government is closely related to the maintenance and attraction of competent personnel. This is sound budget thinking.

Our duty in Congress is clear. Let the record show that the duty of the administration is also clear.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, today 1.6 million Federal employees and their families are watching our deliberations to see if their Government, their employer, will courageously face up to the ugly economic fact that the record high cost of living has reduced their standard of living.

These employees and their families have confidence that the Congress will help restore to them some of the economic position which they lost relative to their counterparts in private industry. As was pointed out so capably in the committee's report submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]:

All that postal and other Federal employees ever have asked of their Government is timely and fair salary provisions. They do not ask for any special or extraordinary treatment, but they rightfully expect not to suffer discrimination or to be sacrificed on the altar of personal or political ambitions. Committee deliberations on the salary problem this year demonstrate once more that the Federal employees can expect and obtain sympathetic and fair salary consideration only through appeals to their elected representatives in Congress. They cannot hope for proper recognition at high executive levels, in terms of fair compensation, for the loyal and efficient services they render.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has considered Federal salary legislation in each of the last four Congresses, including the 86th Congress. Only once in this 7½-year period has there been an administrative proposal for upward salary adjustments—a 5-percent increase during the 84th Congress. All other general salary increase bills have been bitterly opposed. Had the administrative recommendations been followed, over 500,000 postal workers and over 1 million other Federal employees might

have received only a 5-percent increase in 7½ years. There have been three vetoes of pay raise legislation during this period.

Notwithstanding constant administrative opposition, the Congress has succeeded in providing salary increases totaling nearly 20 percent for postal employees and slightly less for other Federal employees during this 7½-year period. Were it not for the intervention of Congress, therefore, Federal employees would be in even greater distress than they now find themselves.

Review of the record confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented, at extended committee hearings on H.R. 9883 and over 80 companion bills, that immediate and substantial Federal employee-salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees.

I think it is of the utmost importance that we unmask for all to see the ruthless attitude of this administration toward Federal employees. We ought to make clear to those of the public who are still misled by the slick Madison Avenue slogans that this much self-advertised "Administration with a heart" has tenderness in its breast—but only for bankers for whom it has every sweet solicitude and whom the administration has enriched to the tune of billions in unwarranted high interest rates paid by each of us.

During the hearings before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee the administration, through its spokesmen, Maurice H. Stans, Robert B. Andersen, and Arthur E. Summerfield staunchly fought well-deserved pay raises for Federal employees, calling such increases inflationary, unjustified, fiscally irresponsible—and, yes, practically un-American.

I am confident that this Congress will again intercede for the many, many conscientious and loyal Government workers and make it unmistakably clear that to hold a Federal job a man or woman does not implicitly have to take a vow of poverty.

I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 9883 by such an overwhelming vote that any thought of a sustainable veto will be out of the question.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], is in Walter Reed Hospital today or he would have been here to vote for this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had the opportunity to listen to the many witnesses who appeared at the hearings held on the pay-increase bill now before us for consideration. It was clearly proven, to my satisfaction, that an increase of at least 9 percent would have to be

granted if our postal and classified Federal employees were to be given adequate help.

They have been suffering real hardships; they have been struggling under the burdens of ever-increasing living costs and high taxes. Those with families to support have found it impossible to make ends meet, and meager living and deprivations have been their lot. In a high percentage of cases, postal employees have had to seek outside work in addition to their post office positions, in order to meet their obligations. This has meant the sacrifice of loss of time with their families and a lessening of their morale and sense of well-being. We find that many wives have had to leave their home duties and find jobs in order to help maintain a decent standard of living. All this is most unfair; surely, our faithful employees are entitled to a living wage, to time for recreation, to a just reward for the services they render.

I was happy to vote for the 9 percent increase and pleased when our committee took favorable action on the bill. Thereafter, when it appeared that there would be a serious delay in bringing the pay increase bill before the House for action, a petition was placed on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the bill. Although I was engaged in a serious primary contest in my congressional district, I made a special trip from New York to Washington for the sole purpose of signing the discharge petition, and then returned immediately to New York to continue with my arduous campaign schedule. I wished to make this effort for our postal and classified Federal employees, because I appreciated the fact that it was imperative for Congress to take favorable action in their behalf without further delay.

Now it appears that the 9 percent increase voted by our committee is in grave danger of defeat; that the President would veto such a bill, and that we do not have enough strength to override the veto. A compromise appears necessary, and the increase of 7½ percent is now proposed. Although I feel that an increase of at least 9 percent should be granted, if that would mean complete defeat of a pay increases bill until next year, then I am compelled to go along with the compromise figure. While the 7½ percent figure is inadequate, it will alleviate somewhat the hardships which our postal and Federal classified employees are now suffering. They look to us for assistance, and it is our duty to help them to the utmost of our ability.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that a pay raise is required for the employees covered by the bill. Therefore, in the event of a veto by the President, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], a member of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, as I sat through the long—and, I must confess, sometimes tedious—hearings before our committee on pay legislation for postal

and other Federal employees, I was struck forcibly by several points.

First of all, I would observe that the representatives of the employee groups and their associates certainly had done their homework; they presented the hard and incontrovertible facts. On the other hand, it seemed to me that much of the administrative opposition delved into as much fancy as fact.

As demonstrated in the committee report, the employees overwhelmingly proved not only their dire need for salary raises—now, not in the future—but also proved beyond question that their request is more than justified.

Administrative opposition, summed up in a nutshell, revolves almost completely around a proposal to delay action pending completion of a study.

Now I, for one, have had enough of administrative studies. As brought out in our hearings, during the past 10 years some 45 authoritative studies on Federal salary matters have been made. Every single one either reposes in a wastebasket or gathers dust in a forgotten file. There have been no tangible results at all.

And so, I think, may be the case with the study which we are now asked to await before granting salary increases. This study is completely beside the point. Even the proponents of the study acknowledge it will deal only with the higher, or supervisory, salary levels. Only a very small percentage of Federal employees possibly could be concerned in that study. Here, we are concerned with over 1½ million employees to whom the study will have very little significance.

The chief and the strongest opponent of any pay raise has been the Post Office Department. In answer to direct questions, departmental representatives as much as confessed they would not approve a 1 percent or 3 percent pay raise. Now let us see how this Department handles its own responsibilities.

This is the same Department that reported officially on its expenditures to a private management consultant for advice as to how the Department should be managed—that is, advice on how officials of the Department should do their jobs. This is the same Department that paid directors of the private consultant \$400 a day for a 4¼-hour day. This is the Department that paid associates of the private consultant as much as \$250 a day for a 4¼-hour day. This is the Department that willingly pays out these outlandish benefits to a private contractor to do work which postal officials should do; but will not agree that the letter carriers for example have earned 17 or 18 cents more an hour, as provided in the substitute amendment we will consider later.

This contracting out of administrative and management responsibilities of itself is highly questionable. The people to whom these vast sums are being paid are purported to be geniuses. It would be all right if they knew the answers, but in this instance, at least, the consultants had to go out and hire still other consultants to help them get the answers.

I hope that the Congress will see to it that our loyal and conscientious postal employees are given just a little bit of

the fine consideration the Department lavished on these consultants to the consultants to the postal officials.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment to H.R. 9883. This bill provides for a 7½ percent increase across the board for all postal employees and makes permanent the 2½ percent temporary increase which the postal employees have been receiving since 1958.

I support this bill because I believe that the greatest force against communism within our borders is a satisfied Government worker who is proud of his employment, satisfied with his salary, and is faithful to his duties. I believe that a Government employee deserves a salary which will permit him to work in dignity, to obtain the basic necessities of life and to maintain his family as a unit. At the present time postal employees are paying this week's bill with next week's check or with borrowed funds. This condition must not be tolerated, it must not be permitted.

Let us examine the status of postal workers. Ninety-five percent of letter carriers are family men. Thirty-one percent must hold down a second job to try to meet their rent, their food expenses and to pay for the education of their children. Forty-three percent of their wives work and when they do their children are to a certain extent neglected. Ninety-three percent of all of the letter carriers operate at a deficit and must borrow funds. The annual deficit of an average letter carrier's family is \$903. Credit unions have demonstrated that postal employees must borrow funds in order to meet their expenses.

This bill will cost our Government an additional \$680 million. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have had the privilege of voting to cut requests and to reduce funds of over a billion dollars for wasteful practices in agricultural projects, in military construction projects, and in wasteful foreign handouts. I have fought for economy but not for false economy. These increases are not inflationary nor are they conducive to inflation. These increases are for services and do not produce a product, the price of which is raised. These services will be rewarded by these increases to meet the inflationary spiral brought about by rising steel prices, by rising military purchases and wasteful administrative practices. Too long have Government employees subsidized with their substandard wages the bonanzas and windfalls which banks and financial institutions received by reason of our Government paying a higher rate of interest on Government bonds. Too long have Government employees subsidized warehousemen who are favored by this administration with high rates for storage of our surplus grain, cotton, and wheat. Too long have our Government employees subsidized with their substandard wages the employees of foreign governments and foreign businesses. We must help now.

While the wages of employees of private concerns rise, the wages of Govern-



ment employees have had percentage increases on originally low salaries. We must realize that if we continue to allow the relative position of postal and governmental employees to deteriorate, our postal service will decline.

We in Congress are the advocates of postal workers and governmental employees. They do not have the right to strike, they cannot resort to collective bargaining to correct inequities, they cannot sit down in the face of speedup systems. They can only come to us, to testify as to their needs, to implore their representatives for economic justice and to be treated as family men and Americans. We have heard their pleas and I for one shall not fail them. I trust that this bill will pass.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883, a bill to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees. Frankly, I believe that a pay increase for our Federal employees is in order, it is deserved, and desirable at this time, particularly as it applies to the postal workers.

Although I have consistently favored legislation for this purpose, I do regret that we find ourselves considering this proposal in this manner. I did not sign the petition for several reasons. As a matter of fact, I have never signed a discharge petition. It seems to me that this move to bring the bill, H.R. 9883, to the floor by this method, without giving adequate opportunity to employ the use of a rule, does more harm than good. There are inequities in this bill and the House is foreclosed from making such changes. As I said, I am for a pay raise and a reasonable raise at that. But we can go too far and perhaps destroy our actual objective.

In any event, I shall support this bill today and I am glad that the committee has at least considered giving the House an opportunity to act on a figure which has a more reasonable chance to become a reality. I hope that this issue and this problem can be resolved properly and well because I sincerely want the employees to receive the salary increase they deserve.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I realize as much as you do the futility of further debating the question involved here. I realize I am not changing any votes.

It seems to me that when we are dealing with legislation to spend well over three-quarters of a billion dollars, the Members of the House should have an opportunity to agree to or disagree with provisions of the bill; however, those who are today the managers of this bill deliberately filed a resolution which was a closed rule—no amendments other than committee amendments could be offered—and then passed it off on the Members of the House whom they urged to sign a discharge petition as the only way they could get a vote for a pay bill.

It should be clear that Resolution 537 provided for an open rule and Members of the House could have voted on various provisions of the bill which they felt should be perfected. The petition method boomeranged on the bill sponsors because they themselves found it expedient to amend the bill. To get this done they exercised every pressure and did not give the Members an opportunity for even an overnight reading of the bill before they forced action.

It is most unfortunate, in my judgment, to delude the million and a half employees into believing a pay raise is now assured. If we are to be guided by the testimony before our committee, the President will not approve this bill as presently written.

The experience of Congress thus far with respect to overriding vetoes is that the House and Senate are in favor of supporting the President. It seems to me that it is not proper to make Federal employees believe they are going to get increases that are not yet in sight. This is what I have tried to avoid.

I offered a 6 percent pay raise amendment in committee. I was prepared to do everything I could to convince the President that such an increase might be approved, but I could not, in the face of our testimony, do it for a bill of this sort which would further distort the pay structure by adding extra pay in certain grades.

Let me repeat, I am in favor of fair, adequate, and equitable pay for those who are employed in Government. I do not believe the bill we are voting on today meets these objectives.

Here is an interesting thing. You have been handed a bill that you have not even seen before. It consists of about 20 or 25 pages. You are going to vote on it without even reading it. You have not had a chance to read it. It involves expenditure of \$700 million. It affects 2 million people in Government. And yet you are required to vote either for or against the bill without having a chance to offer a single amendment. It is rather a poor way of handling legislation in a representative form of government, as I see it. It sounds a little like a dictatorship, does it not? You can judge for yourself. I could add one more thing. You have not even had a chance to look at the hearings, and the worst of it is the leadership in charge of the bill does not seem too concerned. It would not be so bad if it were not so important.

We should recommit the amended bill. We should send it back to the committee, where it could be promptly and carefully considered.

#### FEDERAL PAY SYSTEMS CAN NEVER STAY FIXED

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add the following statement:

It has been my privilege to have served on a committee responsible for civil service affairs of Federal employees ever since I came to Congress in 1937. Through these years it has been my experience that it is indeed difficult to develop any one particular pay plan that will adequately serve the more than 2 million Federal employees. After all, our compensation procedures deal with

people and, as such, the pay procedures and systems must change with the changing times. It was my privilege to be chairman of the Civil Service Committee in 1948 with the 80th Congress, and at that time a study was begun that eventually became the Classification Act as it is basically written today. It required some 2 years' study and work by the committee and its staff to develop the pay plan found in the Classification Act of 1949. Much has happened since then that would cause us to recognize a new pay program is necessary.

#### PRESENT PAY SYSTEM NEEDS CORRECTING

What is wrong with the present pay system? In the first place, the present pay procedure is actually no system at all. Several recent studies of our wage and salary procedures have brought out this point.

Another one of the most common objections to the present classified Federal salary system is that it is overrigid. This is reflected in the existence of conditions under which administrative and operating personnel encounter numerous impediments in the effective accomplishment of programs due to specific requirements of the law. The question may be raised, Have we spent too much time on minute details of job descriptions and have not given enough thought to a declaration of congressional policy on pay for Federal employees?

The value and the effect of exceptional or superior performance of individuals in Government civilian positions have been to a large degree overlooked in the Classification Act as it is presently administered. Each position is placed in a class, and each class is placed in a grade, and each grade by law is given a rigid set of salary rates.

It is now recognized that the step increases in the salary plan as provided in the present classified pay system fall short of realizing the full value of such a plan, both as an incentive for the recruitment of personnel or the retention of employees. It is quite possible a broader range within each grade might give more comparability with pay plans in private industry.

A close examination of the between-grade differentials reveals the inadequacies and inconsistencies of our current pay and salary procedures. There is too little difference, salarywise, between a GS-12, for example, and a GS-13. This might very well retard the development of the abilities and qualifications of personnel, as well as the effective utilization of these employees.

Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to emphasize the point that the Classification Act of 1949, of which we were justly proud at the time it was passed, is in imperative need today for revision.

#### PROPOSED NEW PAY SYSTEM

Last year the Congress made available to the executive branch \$500,000 to develop information for a new concept of compensation of Federal employees. We have been advised by the White House that this information will be available by this fall for study and that it will be available for the Congress January 1, 1961. We have proceeded to take the

first and one of the most important steps forward for a new pay plan.

I believe that one of the key principles needed in such a system will be the principle of comparability.

You may ask the question, what is comparability? Over the years we made no attempt to compare the pay of Federal employees with that in private industry—certainly in the classified jobs. During the 1920's and thirties there was a steady employment in the Federal Government which could not be found in any strict comparability with private industry. However, during the past 25 years labor contracts in such industries as steel, automobile, printing, transportation, and communications have featured the concept that those employees last on the job were the first off. This has meant that for the past quarter of a century there has developed in our private economy a concept of steady employment. It is now possible that we can realistically compare the Government worker, with his steady employment, with his counterpart in private industry.

Some of the other features for a new compensation system, being discussed by both legislative and executive people, would include:

First. Establish not only the principle that Federal salaries should be reasonably comparable with salaries paid by private industry for work of similar difficulty and responsibility but also provide the procedures to obtain on a regular annual basis valid salary and wage information for comparative purposes.

Second, Enable an annual review of Federal salaries and make appropriate adjustments on a timely and equitable basis.

Third. Provide for coordination among existing salary systems in the Federal Government, so that the principle of "equal pay for equal work" will have real meaning.

Fourth. Make such necessary reforms in the Classification Act salary structure as to make it a more effective tool of management and a more appropriate pay schedule of the employees.

This type of compensation plan would serve as a landmark in the history of Federal personnel actions, much as the Classification Act of 1949. However, if this Congress proceeds to go down the road of either a 9 percent or a 7½ percent pay raise, it will mean that this Congress has lost an opportunity to proceed with a lasting and equitable pay system for our Federal employees.

#### SUMMARY

In summary, I am opposed to either a 7½ percent or a 9 percent pay raise at this time. Evidence was not presented to our committee to justify either percentage increase.

An across-the-board pay increase of such size would merely accentuate current inadequacies in our salary and wage procedures. H.R. 9883, as amended, represents a patchwork approach to our compensation systems when actually we need a new and basic change, as I have indicated earlier.

It has been my honor and privilege to work for almost a quarter of a century in the Congress for the civilian employ-

ees of the Federal Government. Over these years I have been impressed by their loyalty, sincerity, and desire to do a good job. The position I take today represents in the long run the constructive and equitable approach for the Federal employee, for the management of our Federal departments and agencies, and for the American taxpayer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege as a new member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to act as one of a group of directors over the largest communications system in the world, namely, the Post Office Department of our Government, which, as you know, represents 50 percent of the postal service of the entire world.

It has also been my privilege to be a member of the Civil Service Committee of the same Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and, as you know, the Civil Service Committee has more to do with the personnel of the largest group of people working for any one instrumentality than any other in the entire world.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand, there is nothing in the legislation under consideration which provides for an increase in the salary of the assistant U.S. attorneys. Now, I think it is indeed unfortunate because here is a class of hard working—and, I mean it, very hard working—dedicated public servants who receive no increase whatsoever. It would seem to me that your committee is overlooking a grave injustice when you report out a bill that does not provide for this group of Federal employees.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very worthwhile legislation and I commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and the other members of the committee for this compromise in an effort to try to avoid a Presidential veto. If a veto should come we should by all means vote to override it.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced a salary increase bill calling for 12½ percent, and I sincerely believe the postal and Government workers are solely in need of that amount if they are to enjoy a decent living; however, the committee has faced the practical reality of trying to pass a bill that reflects a compromise and one that has a chance of being signed by the President or being overridden. For that reason we are supporting the 7½-percent amendment in an effort to take a slice of bread if we cannot have a whole loaf.

Mr. Chairman, we could advance strong arguments for this bill all day long. I have many postal workers in my district who are holding down part-time jobs in an effort to supplement their

inadequate postal salaries, because if they did not they would not be able to provide their families with the bare necessities of life and properly educate their children. In cases such as this the employee and the Government are both being cheated. The Government is being cheated because a man cannot work night and day and give his best to the postal service. The employee is being cheated because he has no time to spend with his family and contribute to his community. Furthermore, the postal worker who holds down two jobs is depriving some unemployed person of the second job that he needs so badly. Mr. Chairman, this is a disgrace to our Federal workers and the Government to force this type of situation upon our postal workers and Federal employees. A 7½-percent raise will not cure all the ills of pay inequity but it will go a long way toward that end. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this much needed legislation because I am confident everyone will benefit.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully throughout the debate this afternoon to see if things had changed any in the past 8 years, and they have not. The arguments of those in opposition have been the same; substantively the same. And, what are they? Well, the minority leader tells us it faces a certain veto. That was the same message conveyed by the same gentleman a number of years ago and repeated on each occasion since. No. 2, we were told the department had a deficit. Well, if we apply the same criteria to every department and agency of the Government, each and every one of them has a deficit. Now we are told we cannot afford it. Well, tomorrow we are going to be asked to vote multibillion dollars for the citizens of other lands. If we can afford that, we can afford to deal with equity and justice to those who work for us.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas says—and this is a reversal of his usual argument—that it gives too much to those at the top and too little at the bottom. For 4 years I heard on the committee that we should revise our approach, because we were creating an imbalance in the relationship of Federal employees by raising too much those on the bottom and not enough those on the top. This is a reversal of the gentleman's position. Now, he also said that he was for 6 percent. Well, I remember when he was for 4 percent and the House gave 8 percent. And the need for more is still there because we have never adequately adjusted salaries. We have never once undertaken a salary adjustment that reflected the many, many months of lag time.

We are told it is against the policy of the administration at this time. And yet this is the very administration which undertook to encourage a settlement in the steel strike which inevitably led this body to a consideration of the need for higher salaries in Federal employment if we were to be even half way reasonably competitive. The truth is, Mr.



Chairman, those who oppose are really opposed to a pay raise now as they have repeatedly been in the past. They have not contended the amount proposed to be excessive, they have fallen back on every other type of argument including the charge of steam rolling. Of course, that charge is not true either. The bill arrives on this floor in complete conformity with the rules of the committee and of the House. The legislation has merit, I urge its adoption.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, although I shall vote for a pay increase bill on final passage today, I should like to register my acute dissatisfaction with the manner in which the leadership has handled this legislation. It is regrettable in the first instance that this legislation was so mishandled as to necessitate the filing of a discharge petition. Nevertheless, a sufficient number of Members saw fit to sign the discharge petition and bring a bill calling for a 9 percent pay increase before the House. Then, on the very day that we are asked to vote on this bill, it is announced that we are to be presented with a substitute version that will not only lower the pay increase to 7½ percent, but will also make other substantive changes in the original text. Now we are to have a bill before us that will be understood by only a handful of Members because no one will have had sufficient time in which to devote the amount of study that a bill of this magnitude demands. No one is absolutely certain as to what will be in the bill and what the effects of the bill will be. I am truly sorry that we must legislate in this fashion. It casts an unfavorable reflection not only on the ability and sincerity of the leadership, but also on the wisdom and deliberativeness of this entire body.

Notwithstanding the highly unorthodox manner in which this legislation has progressed toward final passage, I shall support it because of my sincere belief that the great majority of our Federal employees are conscientious, able, and hard working, and are fully entitled to an increase. My only regret is that we must achieve this worthwhile legislative goal in such an atmosphere of ineptitude.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, those Members of Congress who signed the discharge petition on H.R. 9883, the postal pay increase, have really performed a disservice to the postal and Federal employees that they are seeking to aid, for this reason: the bill having reached the floor cannot adequately be amended to a figure consistent with fiscal responsibility.

Representing as I do a metropolitan area district, I sympathize and appreciate the plight of especially the post office employees in providing for their families under their present wage scale; however, the across-the-board increase, without taking into consideration local standards of living, continues to distort the situation.

Rumor has it that the majority party is deliberately appealing to the emotions of Government employees by promising a pay raise that they realize is impractical, using this issue as a means of drawing a Presidential veto in order to make political capital of the entire matter. This may be clever politics, but it is bad government. Certainly the postal employees deserve understanding and an honest attempt to give them the salary increase to which they are entitled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude my earlier remarks by saying that never in corporate activity would a responsible management go about getting the kind of bill that is before us today. It would not be done. Management would be turned out of business were it to use the methods that were employed on this day in this House, before this Nation, in order to get the raise that is going to be voted by this Congress. This is said without regard to the merits of the matter.

The post office employees made a strong case for a much-needed increase in salaries. However, no such case was made by other employee groups who constitute approximately 1,500,000 Federal employees.

In fact, there is evidence to substantiate that certain existing inequities have become aggravated rather than cured by the present bill before us.

Until a thorough comprehensive method is evolved to establish Federal wage rates the many loyal Federal employees and the general taxpaying public will have to put up with the clumsy, inefficient, inequitable system in use by the present Congress. Some of us hope for better days.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the question of study groups came up. I would like to make this point clear, that since 1953, in the last 7 years, it is reliably reported that there have been 45 study groups on the question of Federal workers' salaries. I want to suggest this, that as far as the Government workers are concerned, they want less study groups and more salary.

I should also like to quote this from the committee report:

The much-publicized steel strike settlement, with the aid of the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor, improved pay and fringe benefits for steelworkers who already were being paid \$3.11 an hour before the strike. The postal clerk and the letter carrier with 20 years of service receives only \$3 an hour.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are at this very moment thousands of dedicated men and women who continue to carry on their daily tasks of helping to provide good government for

this Nation in a most exemplary manner in spite of the fact that each of these persons knows that the present wage structure is shot through with inequities. Now in looking for proof of this charge of wage structure inequity I need go no further than to quote the administration's most recent budget message. President Eisenhower told the Congress in his last budget message that—

Review and coordination of the excessive number of pay plans are the most effective means of removing inequities which adversely affect the Government's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel.

When Federal employees claim that their wages are substandard, thus inadequate, they need to quote only the Government's own figures. According to the latest published data which I am able to produce, the average median annual wage for the great bulk of Federal employees is \$4,875. More significant is the fact that almost one-half of all so-called white-collar workers on the Federal payroll earn less than \$4,500 a year.

Last February Secretary of Labor James Mitchell was quoted as saying that the "spendable earnings" of an industrial worker with three dependents has risen to \$82 a week. The Postal Establishment offers the same worker approximately \$18 a week less take-home pay.

There is ample evidence to show that the present schedule of Federal wages is shamefully inadequate. These standards set by the Federal Government are certainly below the commonly accepted requirement for a healthy and decent standard of living. Wages are below what employees fairly want, what their families need, what the Nation can afford, and what is needed to man our public service with skilled, conscientious, and efficient personnel.

In my 14 years in Congress I have become increasingly impressed with the fact that the civilian employees working for the Federal Government are first and foremost dedicated public servants. These thousands of men and women are daily serving this Nation and giving to the American people the very best kind of government that we can have. And since every laborer is worth his hire this devotion to the common good by these thousands of civilian employees of the Federal Government must be matched with adequate compensation. Living in an era when we are rightly concerned about standards of living in even the remotest corners of the earth and when we justly tax ourselves to provide funds not only for the military defense of the free world but for economic development and for the sharing of our technology and vast natural and material resources, we cannot sit idly by and watch the standard of living creep up among other segments of our economy and at the same time ignore the fact that Federal employees are generally the last to receive needed adjustments in their compensation—often times long after most others in non-Government positions have received their adjustments to meet not only the cost-of-living rise which now seems to occur with almost regularity but also to enjoy an even higher standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is constantly and rightfully using its power and influence to secure wage adjustments for and to help provide a higher standard of living for workers outside the Federal service. The Congress must not sit idly by and set standards for private industry and fail to meet these same standards when it comes to its own employees. To do so will be courting danger, real and eminent, and will certainly eventually lead to increased inefficiency and lessening of service to the people of all the States. Like wages in private industry, the Federal wage structure must be kept constantly under review so as to reflect sharp increases in the cost of living and so as to provide even more of the comforts and conveniences as well as the necessities for daily living that go to make up every man's life. As we advance technologically and as more products and services are made available to ease man's burden and raise his living standards, we must make certain that Federal workers are able to partake of these blessings.

In his state of the Union message last January the President told this Congress, "1960 promises to be the most prosperous in our history." This means higher production, higher employment, slowly rising prices, about a 2-percent increase in the Consumer's Price Index, a continued rise in profits and dividends, higher wages and salaries. This does add up to more prosperity except for the Federal employees unless the adjustments called for in this bill are enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, this is worthy legislation, and I urge its approval.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the present administration is more in tune with the interests of the largest banking and industrial groups than it is with the interests of ordinary citizens. The farmers, the small businessman, the aged people all find that either the administration is opposed to the programs which are needed for their welfare, or it has no program whatever.

This same attitude extends to the field of public employment. For a number of years, postal and other Federal employees have been seriously underpaid. Today, I look forward to the opportunity to vote in favor of a long overdue and much needed increase in pay for these loyal public servants.

I am sorry that the bill before us took so long in reaching this stage. It is more than idle rumor to expect that the President will veto the bill we are about to pass, and that accordingly, the bill must be sent to the desk of the President quickly if we are to have a chance to escape a pocket veto.

The certainty of the veto is found in the statements made by official witnesses before the committees holding hearings on pay legislation, and also by the very character of the witnesses who arose in opposition to postal and other Federal employees' pay legislation.

Seasoned observers with long legislative records tell me they have never seen so many officials of Cabinet rank come to Capitol Hill to declare the administration's opposition to any pay adjustment.

The Postmaster General, himself, evaded a direct response to the question about whether he would favor as much as a 1-percent, across-the-board increase. Asked by the ranking majority member of the committee whether he would be in favor of such an increase, the Postmaster General responded:

You know that is very interesting. I wish you might have asked me some of these questions earlier.

The Federal employees have been asking questions. They have been asking why it is that they, of all people, in the United States, should be singled out to suffer to a greater degree than others the impact of income deficit.

We have heard a great deal about the postal deficit and the way in which the increase before us would add significantly to that deficit.

It is appropriate to turn the question around and to ask, instead, of the administration, whether it has considered the ways in which the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees have suffered their own deficits and are even now unable to compete in the economic marketplace. The grocer does not give a special price to the Federal employee. Nor does the Federal employee live in endowed housing. Similarly he does not enjoy lower doctor bills or any other type of special considerations.

The only consideration upon which the Federal employee may rely is that which is forthcoming from the Congress of the United States. In House Report No. 1636, accompanying the bill before us, it is declared that in just 10 years Federal employees have been pushed 20 percent lower in their standards of living in comparison to their friends and neighbors in private enterprise. The report declares:

There is only one place that the employees can come with any hope for remedial measures; that is to their Congress.

Today, we are about to undertake to give to the loyal Federal public servants a measure of the economic consideration they so desperately need. I shall be happy to vote for the pay bill, and I hope that it will be sent quickly to the President's desk in order that we may have an opportunity to take final action on the bill before Congress adjourns.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I support reasonable pay increases this year. It will be sad, indeed, if the insistence on 7½-percent defeats all legislation in this field. The Congress has been irresponsible with the issue by not providing increased revenues to carry the cost of well-deserved pay increases. I am convinced that the President will have to veto an increase as high as 7½ percent and the workers may then end up with nothing at all this year. A 5-percent increase this year, pending a full study of all Federal payrolls next year, is the fairest approach to the problem. I am sorry that political maneuvering has placed our fine postal and classified employees in this kind of a bind, as there is reason to believe that the President could sign a 5-percent bill even under present circumstances.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, it has been no easy task to wade through the

confusing and often conflicting statistics that we have had to look at in order to try to determine the justification for any salary increases at the present time. As for myself, I have attempted to supplement the doubtful value of those statistics with information obtained directly from postal workers in my own congressional district.

Some of this information I have acquired through personal interviews with them, and part of it from budget sheets which they have sent to me at my suggestion showing their earnings and normal living expenses. For the great majority of postal families with whom I have had such contact it is readily apparent that they are having a difficult time making ends meet. One of the best yardsticks of this would seem to be the following results of a survey I took of my major post offices in an effort to find out how many employees either had to supplement their Federal wage with outside jobs, or had to send their wives to work.

In Binghamton, N.Y., with 362 employees of which only 303 were checked, 59 men had outside jobs and there were 102 working wives. In Johnson City, N.Y., with 46 employees, there were 12 men with outside jobs and 5 working wives. In Endicott, N.Y., with 82 employees, only 14 of those employees had neither outside jobs or working wives. In Corning, N.Y., where there are 49 employees, 5 had outside jobs and 17 had wives with jobs. In Elmira, N.Y., with 171 employees, 58 had to supplement their wages with outside, after-hours employment, and 60 had wives who were working to add to the family income. In Hornell, N.Y., with 41 employees, 12 had outside jobs and 15 had wives with jobs. Finally, in my own hometown of Owego, N.Y., with 20 employees, 5 men had after-hours work and there were 12 working wives.

And so the pattern went. Even assuming that it is not unusual nowadays for many wives to work, if they are free of confining household tasks, even though their husbands earn an ample wage for the family needs, I was and am convinced that the case of need for a proper salary adjustment, at least in the lower income brackets, had been made. The question remained of how much?

On this point, no matter what we may do we will not and cannot satisfy everyone. We can only use our best judgment. I was of the opinion, and so frankly stated to my postal and Federal employee constituents, that a 9 percent, across-the-board raise at the present time was too much, particularly in high-salaried classifications. Speaking frankly again, I have serious reservations as to the wisdom of as much as 7½ percent, but since at this point that appears to be the only figure that will come before me I shall vote for it with some reluctance. In doing so, I shall also continue to hope for the day when these matters are removed from the political arena.

In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that the President in his budget message to the Congress last January stated:

Continued patching of individual Federal salary systems is not satisfactory as a sub-



stitute for a comprehensive Federal pay policy, which should be developed either by authorizing a Joint Commission such as I proposed or by some other equally effective means. Pending development and adoption of such a comprehensive policy, a general pay raise would be unwarranted, unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, and inequitable as among employees compensated under different and unrelated pay systems.

That is a strong and realistic statement but there has been no action to establish a Joint Commission.

Neither has there been any serious consideration of the President's postage rate increase proposals which would partially finance a salary increase.

If the fate of this bill is a veto, the failure of the Congress to seek long-range solutions to Federal pay problems and the expedient insistence on patchwork measures in election years will be to blame. The postal and classified employees in the lower pay ranges will be the chief losers, penalized by short-sighted and fiscally irresponsible attitudes in the Congress.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, following careful examination of the record, which confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented in extended committee hearings, I most earnestly hope that prompt approving action will be taken on this measure granting a reasonable cost of living pay adjustment to our postal and Federal employees.

Our Federal employees form a large and important part of our population. The various services they render are fundamental and essential to national progress.

It is only practical common sense and recognition of the facts of life that if our faithful postal workers and Government employees are encouraged, by reasonable cost of living salary adjustments, to meet their family obligations and face the future with a certain confidence, then there will be no doubt about their efficient duty performance, their loyalty as good Americans, and their repudiation of any and all Communist inspired propaganda.

The present bill we are considering can accomplish these good objectives in the national interest while at the same time extending fair and just treatment to Federal employees in comparison with similar responsibilities in private industry.

As you are well aware the salaries of our Government employees are set by law and it requires the action of the Congress to adjust their compensation. Let us fulfill the trust they have demonstrated in the Congress for fair play and fair treatment and let us approve this bill without further delay.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883, a bill which I believe to be not only well deserved but long overdue. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I do have a large number of classified Federal employees and postal workers in my district and I know how increasingly difficult it has become for them and their families to make ends meet. The committee report, which I hope all Members have had an opportunity to study, makes this abundantly clear—especially the specious arguments against a pay increase set forth in the minority views.

The real fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the Post Office Department is the biggest business in the world, employing 550,000 people in 42,000 offices. Yet, despite the fact that personnel standards are high, both with respect to intelligence and character, three-quarters of all postal employees must exist on salaries of less than \$5,000 and only after 18 years of continuous service can a postal worker receive \$5,000 a year, and his maximum compensation after 25 years of service is \$5,175 per annum.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us goes to the very conscience of our Nation. Can we, as the minority report would have us do, view with complacency a Federal personnel policy based upon substandard wages. I think not. I must say it is beyond argument that the present administration's attitude is one of deliberate indifference in which pay increases for Federal workers have been sacrificed on the altar of an anticipated \$4 billion budget surplus. Thus, as in so many other areas, it becomes incumbent upon the Congress to assume leadership in this area and to take action which we know to be necessary.

I say necessary, Mr. Chairman, because the average salary of a post office employee is only \$4,600—not enough to clothe, feed, and provide shelter for families, let alone educate children and provide a minimum of entertainment and recreation. We must bear in mind, surely, that research studies have shown that an average family enjoying a normal standard of living must have an annual income of \$6,600.

Clearly, if there is one group that has been left behind in the parade toward higher income to meet higher costs of living, it is our classified and postal workers. If anyone in this body has any question on this point, I wish they would come with me to Toledo, Ohio, and talk to some of our postal and other Federal employees who are willing to open up their family budgets and show that it simply is not possible for them to pay for needed medicine and other essentials. A college education for children of these families is simply out of the question unless they happen to qualify for a complete scholarship.

Mr. Chairman, all of us look back with shuddering and disgust at the economic exploitation which took place in this country a half a century ago in the meat-packing, coal mining, and other industries. Is the present status of our Federal employees so much worse?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to lend my support to the passage of H.R. 9883 to provide our postal and other Federal employees a much-needed pay raise. The facts speak for themselves. In a recent issue of Labor Week figures arrived at from basic data of the U.S. Department of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture, pointed out that the average weekly real income of postal and other Federal workers was down 3.3 percent from last year.

While the increase in salary provided by this bill is modest, it will mean a great deal to a postal employee who is trying

to feed, clothe, house and educate a family—in many cases a large family—on a weekly take-home pay of \$82 to \$87.

Under the present pay scale, the postal employee receives less pay than the unskilled worker. Three Presidential vetoes have put his pay rate several years behind that of his fellow workers in private industry. I hope that this time the President will approve this well-deserved recognition of devoted service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the proposals set forth by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] on behalf of the faithful postal and classified Federal workers who are doing such a wonderful job for our Government despite the fact they are underpaid.

I know the committee in its careful consideration of H.R. 9883 heard many, many instances of how our Federal employees are forced to moonlight and take extra jobs, how their wives are forced to work, and other ways that they are trying to make ends meet.

I think that it is a disgrace that this should have to happen in the postal, and Federal services. We should pay our people a salary which will permit them to live and enjoy the American standard of living. No one should become a second-class citizen, economically, because he is patriotic enough to work for the Government.

I represent the great State of California, and in our State university we have a highly respected and completely independent group of economists, quite generally known as the Heller committee, which was set up for the purpose of research in social economics. The Heller committee operates on the concept that its purpose is to describe and present figures based on salary necessary for an employee to receive in order to live at what is currently recognized as comfortable living. Of course this committee goes beyond the rigid confines of cost-of-living in attempting to describe necessary wages for an employee and his family to have what is considered a comfortable living. They agree, as do I, that there certainly must be more in this life than a bare existence. The Heller committee is receiving and has received more than normal recognition in my State and throughout the United States as the outstanding authority in its field and I feel that its recommendations are of extreme value. Might I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Heller committee, in its recent report, indicates that an employee with a wife and two children who owns his home, should receive a salary of \$6,638 per year. A wage earner who rents his home should receive a salary of \$6,271. These salaries are recommended by the Heller committee on the premise that they will meet the American standard of living—a reasonably comfortable living for an employee and his family.

I urge you gentlemen here to provide a decent living wage for our Federal workers. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, this important debate has but a few minutes yet to claim the attention of the Members before we are called upon to vote upon the issue of whether or not there

shall be straight across the boards 7½-percent increases for the postal and other Federal employees. And, while it is stated by the committee there will be an amendment offered to reduce the percentage from 9 percent, as previously voted for by the committee, to the 7½ percent this morning voted by the committee, the basic reason justifying any proposed increase is the same. The report by our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, stated it was recommended as a strong and timely affirmation of the historic policy of the Congress that employees of the Government of the United States of America should receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform for the taxpayers of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I conclude that their considered recommendation of the 7½-percent increase straight across the boards for the postal workers and other Federal employees, constitutes a crystal-clear recognition that the historic policy of Congress, should be placed in practical terms and application in accordance with their recommendation that the increase be 7½ percent. They apparently recommend this because it has become apparent that there is no reasonable chance for the White House to approve so much of an increase as 9 percent. This recommendation of reduction to 7½ percent is, therefore, a necessary compromise. I not only respect our committee for making the recommendation to lower to 7½ percent under the circumstances, but I compliment them on doing so. For this 7½-percent recommendation is not one whit inconsistent with the firm policy which I basically believe in, to wit, that our post office and other Federal employees should be accorded salaries substantially in accord with those in private enterprise, for similar and comparable services.

For several years now, I have been pleased to take the time and make the effort of somewhat of a personal study of conditions under which many of the postal employees and their families in my congressional district live. I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, to my personal knowledge, dozens of these postal workers are engaged in supplementary earning jobs, either before or after their regular post office work is completed. Of necessity, they have to seek supplemental jobs because their postal salary is not adequate and sufficient for them and their growing families to decently get by on. In many cases their wives, the mothers of growing children, necessarily leave the home during hours when they should be home giving supervision to their growing children; to also add to the family income for shoes, bread, and butter, and educational advantages for their children. Many wives leave their children in care of babysitters, or public kindergartens; or day nurseries, and go to work to help out. They have to.

The committee report specifies present earnings and anticipated earnings if this bill passes. It identifies the necessity of this 7½ percent as a minimum. The postal and other Federal workers have no recourse to obtain a decent salary in-

crease excepting by action of Congress. They cannot present their just claims for decent salary increases excepting to committees of Congress and the full membership of Congress. The reasonable and constructive basis of collective bargaining is not available to them.

Mr. Chairman, I surmise that when this bill comes up for final passage, because this 7½ percent increase straight across the boards is recognized as so reasonable and necessary and just, that many Members of this great legislative body who inherently would like to support the position taken by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in opposing this raise proposal, will be found voting "aye." I surely hope so. I am reasonably sure that all the Members of the California delegation on both sides of the political aisle recognize that with the steady and sharp increase in the cost of living in California, the cost of the necessities of life in California, will justify an "aye" vote for this 7½-percent proposal. I shall vote for it even though the distinguished minority leader has stated on this floor, substantially, he did not believe the bill would finally be enacted into law. This would indicate that while he stated it was his own individual opinion, and that the President of the United States had not told him what his opinion was and what he would do, he expects a veto. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for what I conscientiously and firmly believe to be right and just in the premises.

The additional sum of less than \$700 million will not increase inflation for it will be expended by these postal and other Federal workers for the necessities of life. It will not unbalance the budget. It will not be unjust or unfair to employees in private industry. It will not set an unreasonable or impractical minimum.

Mr. Chairman, it will give to the employees involved what they deserve and what is right and just for the taxpayers, acting through this great Congress, to extend to their fellow Americans in the postal and other Federal employment.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation in its present form to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees. I shall vote for the bill.

In the congressional district I represent, the postal and other Federal employees compose one of the groups which suffers most because of the high cost of living. At present rates it is virtually impossible for postal employees to maintain a decent standard of living.

I have had many discussions with groups of postal workers and other Federal employees who live in New York City and I can attest that most of them are forced to take additional employment elsewhere during their off hours. Their wives work in order to meet essential needs. Is it too much to ask that these citizens be adequately compensated?

It is unfortunate that those Federal employees who live in large urban areas should be penalized. I am hopeful that one day we will enact Federal pay legislation that is realistically geared to a

cost of living index around the country. What may be fair pay in a small rural community is not fair pay in New York City.

This bill, calling for a 7½-percent across-the-board increase is a fair compromise and I am happy to vote for it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, our Government has a tremendous responsibility today—greater than ever before. The quality of the discharge of this responsibility depends to a very great extent upon the 2,200,000 civilian employees of the Government.

There are a number of ways in which pay scales can affect the quality of the work the Government receives from its civilian employees: First, by attracting more and better qualified candidates for Government service; second, by encouraging experienced employees to remain in Government service; third, by providing incentive and increasing morale. We cannot afford today to have a demoralized civil service.

There has not always been a crisis. We have been fortunate to have employees of quality and dedication. We could have continued to underpay our employees and would still have had many who were dedicated and qualified—and only considerations of the justice of it all would have made us pay them more. But today, we are forced to consider more than justice.

We need to make Government service attractive to young people who will make it their career. Young people today are not so much interested in the things that are going to happen to them in 20 to 30 years from now as they are in the immediate present. They think not in terms of some future date, but in terms of today, in terms of present-day food and clothing and shelter, and education for their children. Unless the wage of postal and Federal employees is made and remains sufficiently attractive, the postal service and the Government generally are going to be unable to attract and, perhaps even more important, retain the best type of young people. Low pay scales force the prospective employee to choose between responsibility to his job interests or his loyalty to his Government and responsibility to the economic well-being of his family.

The "Report on Civilian Compensation in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government," compiled by the steering committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Civilian Compensation in November 1957, stated in summary:

Personnel turnover is increasing and quality is decreasing. Many jobs remain unfilled. Quality and quantity of applicants is inadequate.

Why are we failing to attract qualified applicants? Why are dropouts increasing? The committee hearings on Federal and postal pay raise bills are full of figures indicating that pay of Government workers is lagging seriously behind rates for comparable jobs in the private sector of the economy. For example, during the period between July 1951 and November 1959, post office clerks received wage increases averaging 38½ cents per hour, or approximately 20 percent, while production workers in manu-



facturing industries received wage increases averaging 70 cents per hour and in excess of 45 percent. In July of 1951, after the enactment of Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress, the entrance rate for a substitute post office clerk was \$1.61½ per hour. This was about 1.8 cents per hour above the industrial average. By November of 1959 the entrance rate for a post office clerk was 27.2 cents per hour short of the industrial average.

The purchasing power of many Government employees today is substantially behind that of 1939. For G-5, G-7, G-9, G-11 and G-13 employees, a percentage wage increase of from 5.2 percent to 20.3 percent would be necessary to give them the purchasing power they had before the war.

A study of pay scales for policemen and firemen in large metropolitan centers, where 40 percent of all postal employees live and work, reveals that the lowest wage in 10 of 17 cities studied was greater than the highest wage which a letter carrier or clerk can receive according to the national postal salary schedule.

The evidence presented to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service clearly shows, according to indicators such as purchasing power and comparative wages, that our Government and postal employees are underpaid.

A pay raise for Federal employees has been criticized as a contribution to inflation. We do not know if rising wages are a cause of inflation. Even if they were, merely equalizing wages of Federal employees would not push up other wages. Those wage demands which endanger stability are not the ones which equalize, but those which are excessive and unnecessary. It is definitely not excessive and unreasonable to ask that Federal employees be paid at rates "reasonably comparable" to those in private business. The administration cites reasonable comparability as a basis for judgment of Federal wage scales. If this is so, why do they not help us to make the wages comparable?

The administration suggests that we should wait for further studies of comparability. Many of us would like to see a comprehensive plan for coupling Government and postal pay increases to increases in the rest of the economy. But we cannot wait. Should we postpone a raise in salaries, we will have increasing difficulty in finding qualified applicants for Government service, increasing numbers of resignations, and increasing demoralization. Do we have the right to say once again to our Government and postal employees: "Just wait another couple of years and keep up your good spirits. As soon as we finish all our studies of the problem we will all agree on a comprehensive plan to provide regular salary increases. We are sorry, but we just do not know yet how to give you the salaries you deserve."

We need qualified workers in Government service. There, employees are performing functions which are crucial to the national defense, safety, economy, and welfare. Large numbers of them act in direct support of defense activ-

ities or in other equally important tasks wherein failure might adversely affect the entire Nation. Not only do we have a responsibility to our present employees, but it is necessary that we have a Government service which is efficient and up to the enormous responsibility which faces it. I would feel responsible to neither my fellow citizens who are Government workers nor to the citizens of the country who demand and deserve good government, if I did not continue to support a just rate of pay for Federal and postal employees. H.R. 9883 will go a long way toward making their salaries what they should be.

Mrs. GRANAHA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support and urge favorable action on H.R. 9883, a bill to reaffirm the historic policy of Congress that employees of the Government of the United States shall receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform.

To state the objective differently, the bill recognizes that the high quality of service which is required for the conduct of the Government's business warrants recognition, in terms of salaries and wage rates, at least equal to that which is given to comparable services in private enterprise which is protected and supported by the Government.

As originally reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this bill would provide fair and reasonable compensation comparable to that enjoyed by employees in private industry by giving a 9-percent across-the-board pay increase to those categories of Federal employees consistently included in salary legislation. As now amended, it provides a somewhat lesser raise of 7½ percent, which is certainly not excessive in any event and represents a sincere effort to make sure that this legislation does not end in a stalemate between Congress and the Executive. If this bill is vetoed and the veto is not overridden, then it will be obvious to all that no compromise could possibly have been effected, since those of us concerned with this legislation have more than leaned over backward to try to pass a bill which can become law.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 establishes beyond a doubt that a pay increase is warranted. During its consideration of the various pay bills, the committee was faced with the difficult problem of deciding what rate of increase should be proposed. It is my conviction that this decision should be based on a determination of the amount required to provide Federal employees with pay comparable to that in private enterprise. This view recognizes that all that postal and other Federal employees have ever asked of their Government is fair and timely salary provisions.

My motion in committee to amend H.R. 9883 to provide for a 9-percent across-the-board increase was approved by the committee on a conclusion that this amount of increase would achieve reasonable comparability.

The proposed pay increases would apply to slightly more than 1½ million employees of the Federal Government. The 9-percent raise would have meant an estimated cost of approximately \$846

million. The lesser raise will cost about \$680 million. It must be recognized that these 1½ million employees are the people responsible for performing the tasks incident to an annual Federal expenditure of well over \$70 billion. It seems to me that the estimated cost is a completely reasonable price to pay to assure fair compensation to a group of employees who, in the aggregate, bear so great a responsibility.

The opposition to a pay increase has been based primarily on two arguments, neither of which, to me, is persuasive.

In the first place, the administration has argued that a pay increase at this time would have an unfavorable effect on its anticipated \$4.2 billion budget surplus for next year. Certainly, there can be no argument against economical government or against the achievement of a budget surplus by legitimate economies. At the same time, reasonable people will agree, I think, that withholding pay from its work force is too high a price to pay for a budget surplus. This argument against pay increases raises a serious question whether the administration may be seeking to achieve personal objectives and political advantage at the expense of its civilian employees, who are clearly entitled to a salary increase at this time.

The second major argument has been that all efforts to adjust Federal salaries should await the results of a comparative study of Federal and private industry salaries, which has been recently undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This argument, it seems to me, is completely specious in the light of the overwhelming evidence which shows that Federal employees generally are now far below the levels of comparable salaries in private enterprise. Administration representatives who now oppose pay increases have themselves consistently maintained that the Government has extreme difficulty in recruiting and retaining competent employees in the Government because of disparities in pay. In this connection, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on December 4, 1959, stated:

In contrast, statutory increases in the Classification Act pay schedules have been much less frequent and have usually trailed far behind such changes in industry. The result has been an almost continuing unfavorable competitive position in the labor market for the kinds and quality of white collar employees needed to staff the varied and complex activities of our Government.

It is difficult to understand what purpose, other than mere delay, would be accomplished by awaiting the results of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey in the face of the clear evidence we have before us.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 and a number of companion bills establishes without any doubt that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. The evidence clearly shows that (a) Federal employees are substantially below the level of the national economy; (b) that the salaries paid Federal employees do not compare

favorably to salaries paid for comparable work in private enterprise; and (c) that the rates of salary increases for Federal employees have lagged far behind the rates of increases in private enterprise over a period of years.

The following are only a few of the many comparisons which were presented during the committee hearings and which convince me that pay increases are justified at this time.

The largest single group of employees in the postal service are the clerks and letter carriers. The responsibilities of their jobs have been compared to those of policemen and firemen. Postal clerks and carriers are paid in a salary range of from \$4,035 to \$4,875 per year. This is generally about \$1,000 a year below the pay ranges of policemen and firemen in 60 large metropolitan centers. In one of the largest cities, for example, policemen and firemen are paid in a range of \$6,396 to \$6,828, roughly \$2,000 more per year than postal clerks and carriers.

The average weekly earnings of postal letter carriers is \$89.23. A recent Department of Labor publication shows that the average weekly earnings of production workers in various industrial groups ranges from a low of \$91.30 to a high of \$118.13. In other words, in January 1960 the lowest paid group of industrial workers earned \$2 per week more on the average than did the postal employees. The highest paid group of industrial workers earned approximately 30 percent more than the average postal employee.

The same unfavorable comparison is shown between Federal employees in the classified service and employees on comparable jobs in private enterprise. For example, evidence has been presented to show that in 10 selected cities in the country tabulating machine operators earn an average of from \$4,487 to \$5,321 per year. Federal employees doing the same kind of work are paid \$3,814 per year. Draftsmen in private industry earn from \$5,686 to \$6,443 per annum as compared to Federal pay for the same work of \$4,560 per year.

A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that guards in private industry in various cities are paid at rates ranging from \$1.80 per hour to \$2.45 per hour. The entrance pay for guards in the civilian service in the Government is \$1.57 per hour and the maximum rate a guard can earn is \$1.84 per hour.

I think these few examples of comparable salary rates are sufficient to show without any doubt that the current rates of pay for Federal employees are substantially below those of comparable workers in private enterprise. Equally conclusive evidence has been presented to show that the salaries paid to Federal workers have not kept pace with the increases and cost of living and as a result it is now necessary for far too many Federal employees to accept outside spare time employment in order to provide their families with the necessities of life.

It has also been shown, and this is admitted by administration representatives, that a great deal of the turnover of technical and professional people in

the Government results from the Government's inability under existing salary scales to successfully compete with private industry for the services of those capable and well qualified necessary to perform many of the Government's functions.

I urge favorable action on this bill in order to recognize fairly and equitably the loyal, devoted service of the Government's civilian employees by giving them pay more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by their counterparts in private enterprise. Favorable action would further assure the Government's ability to recruit and retain the employees who have the qualifications and abilities to carry out the important responsibilities necessary to the preservation of the Government.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I was the first Member of the House to join our colleague, Representative THOMPSON, in signing the discharge petition which succeeded in bringing this bill before us, a discharge petition I am glad to say that I persuaded many other Members of the House also to sign. It is unfortunate that we had to take this unusual means of obtaining signatures from a majority of the membership in order to overcome obstructions to the orderly consideration of this bill under normal procedures.

Those of us who favor fair treatment for Uncle Sam's rank-and-file employees have had to wage a constant battle against an unsympathetic administration which flatly opposes pay raises for the average worker. This has been the policy from President Eisenhower on down. Week after week, we sat in committee listening to the pros and cons on this legislation, and throughout the period of the hearings there was a constant drumbeat of administration propaganda against any pay increase whatsoever.

At this moment, we are being told that if we reduce the size of the proposed increase even further—say to 5 percent—and perhaps add higher postal rates to it, there is a possibility, or a remote outside chance, that the President may sign such a bill. It is all very nebulous. Yet, all of the time we were considering this legislation in committee, the administration laid down a flat rule of no raise at all for the rank-and-file of employees.

On the other hand, no administration has ever worked harder at trying to obtain pay increases for the policymakers of the Government—particularly those in politically appointive offices. The top level of civil service, in these recent years of the Eisenhower administration, has been changed almost entirely into a patronage pool for the Republican National Committee. Career Government employees are given to understand that it helps to have Republican ties if they expect to obtain promotion to the top posts in what is supposed to be the career service. I am sure if it could find a way to provide pay increases only for Government employees in so-called policymaking jobs—and under this administration that covers a multitude of employees with political sponsorship—the administration would

gladly support such a bill. But this bill—to reward the entire classified and postal services—is bitterly opposed on grounds that the cost of living has not risen enough since the last pay raise to justify the proposed increases so why enable any Government worker to get ahead?

When organized labor was fighting for the principle of wage escalation to meet increases in living costs, many of the same people now deciding policy for this administration bitterly opposed the idea as something right out of Moscow. Actually, of course, collective bargaining as we know it is the farthest thing away from the Russian system, but you would not think so to hear some of the complaints about unions—all unions.

It is now an accepted part of our industrial economic structure, of course, that cost-of-living increases should be reflected in wage settlements. But that is by no means the only measure of justifiable wage settlements in industry. Industry and labor also agree on increases reflecting increased productivity, on increases based on increased complexity of the work, on increases based on higher educational requirements or longer periods of training and so forth.

Now why should none of these things be taken into consideration in determining the wages of our Government employees? According to the administration, the only gage should be living costs. I disagree. I do not believe we must have a static wage structure in Government since we certainly do not have one in any other field. It is not enough, under the American system, that a worker stay even with his earning power of 10 or 20 years ago in terms of real income. Our economy has prospered because most workers steadily, over the years, have been able to improve their standard of living—which requires increase over and beyond living cost increases.

In the postal system, I can say from firsthand knowledge that low wages are a major cause of poor employee morale and much turnover in personnel. We are forcing out good people who had intended to make their careers in the postal service. They cannot afford to remain. Those who take pride in the service, who have long years of seniority, and who grew up in the post office and have developed a dedication to the public service, have suffered real financial hardship in recent years as workers in other fields obtained, through collective bargaining, far better pay scales than the postal employee. Many postal workers are on double duty, taking other off-hour jobs in order to make ends meet. This is not fair to them or to their families, and it is not fair to the taxpayer who wants and expects alert and wide awake and conscientious service from the post office.

This is not the time, perhaps, to go into the other problems of the postal people under the weird operational policies now in effect, but the combination of low pay in comparison to other workers plus the aggravations of trying to keep up with the razzle-dazzle of post office directive and guidelines and ex-



perimentation in mail routing policies—policies which seem to be based on a program of change merely for the sake of change—make the postal service a most unhappy place these days. A wage raise will help, at least, to make it a little pleasanter until we can get rid of bungling and chaos in the Department.

For the career classified employee, the situation has not been quite as unhappy as it has been for the postal employee in recent years. The people brought in by the Eisenhower administration to run the other Government departments nearly all started out on the assumption that Government workers were drones and morons, but gradually changed their opinions after discovering to their surprise the quality of work done by the career employees and their conscientious devotion to duty. So it has not been fashionable lately in most agencies—as it has been during the past 7 years in the Post Office Department—to regard the Government employee as a brainless, slipshod, disinterested worker. Nevertheless, Government employment has not yet been restored to the professional prestige it enjoyed prior to this administration, and pay scales have not kept pace with the rates paid to people with similar skills in industry and the professions. This bill now before us will help to correct some of the inequality.

It is on the whole a good bill. We on the committee worked long and hard on it. It deserves not only the votes it will receive to assure its passage here today but sufficient additional votes to show we can overcome a veto. I hope every Member who sincerely believes in the importance of the work done by our classified and postal employees will make his convictions meaningful by supporting this bill. Regardless of our politics, we all know how devoted our postal employees have been in the past—how careful and conscientious and dedicated to service. That spirit is now unfortunately going out of the postal service—has been going out of the service—because of the way the career people have been treated by their top bosses in Washington. Many postal workers more and more take the attitude of "What's the use?" This trend must be reversed. The place to start is on pay scales—right now. I hope with new leadership in the Department in Washington we can take care of the other side of this problem—the operational chaos and bungling. Congress cannot solve that problem right now—the voters must act first. But we will solve it, I hope, next year.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

# "TITLE I—POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES"

## "Short title"

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Postal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'."

# "Postal field service schedule"

"SEC. 102. The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301(a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (72 Stat. 145, 215; 39 U.S.C. 971 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

## "Postal field service schedule"

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	\$3,520	\$3,635	\$3,750	\$3,865	\$3,980	\$4,095	\$4,210
2	3,755	3,875	3,995	4,115	4,235	4,355	4,475
3	4,020	4,150	4,290	4,430	4,570	4,710	4,850
4	4,415	4,565	4,715	4,865	5,015	5,165	5,315
5	4,690	4,845	4,970	5,125	5,280	5,435	5,590
6	5,040	5,210	5,380	5,550	5,720	5,890	6,060
7	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365	6,550
8	5,920	6,120	6,320	6,520	6,720	6,920	7,120
9	6,355	6,575	6,795	7,015	7,235	7,455	7,675
10	6,965	7,205	7,445	7,685	7,925	8,165	8,405
11	7,670	7,930	8,190	8,450	8,710	8,970	9,230
12	8,450	8,735	9,020	9,305	9,590	9,875	10,160
13	9,290	9,600	9,910	10,220	10,530	10,840	11,150
14	10,230	10,565	10,900	11,235	11,570	11,905	12,240
15	11,230	11,595	11,960	12,325	12,690	13,055	13,420
16	12,375	12,740	13,105	13,470	13,835	14,200	14,565
17	13,695	14,060	14,425	14,790	15,155	15,520	15,885
18	15,375	15,740	16,105	16,470	16,835	17,200	
19	16,815	17,180	17,545				
20	17,440						

## "Rural carrier schedule"

"SEC. 103. (a) The Rural Carrier Schedule contained in section 302(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(a)), is amended to read as follows:

## "Rural carrier schedule"

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	\$2,291.00	\$2,362.00	\$2,433.00	\$2,504.00	\$2,575.00	\$2,646.00	\$2,717.00
Compensation per mile per annum							
for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	65.00	67.00	69.00	71.00	73.00	75.00	77.00
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	2,291.00						
Compensation per mile per annum							
for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	65.00						
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	24.00						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

"(1) Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier."

"(b) Section 302(c) of such Act, as amended (69 Stat. 119, 72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(c)), is amended by striking out '\$5,165 during the period referred to in section 304(c) or \$5,035 thereafter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the basic salary for the maxi-

mum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for a route sixty-one miles in length'."

## "Fourth-class office schedule"

"SEC. 104. The Fourth-Class Office Schedule contained in section 303(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 973(a)), is amended to read as follows:

## "4th-class office schedule"

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
\$1,300 to \$1,499.99.....	\$3,023	\$3,123	\$3,223	\$3,323	\$3,423	\$3,523	\$3,623
\$500 to \$1,299.99.....	2,768	2,860	2,952	3,044	3,136	3,228	3,320
\$300 to \$499.99.....	2,267	2,343	2,419	2,495	2,571	2,647	2,723
\$150 to \$299.99.....	1,761	1,819	1,877	1,935	1,993	2,051	2,109
\$75 to \$149.99.....	1,261	1,302	1,343	1,384	1,425	1,466	1,507
\$37 to \$74.99.....	1,007	1,040	1,073	1,106	1,139	1,172	1,205
\$18 to \$36.99.....	755	779	803	827	851	875	899
Under \$18.....	505	521	537	553	569	585	601

## "Related provisions covering postal field service employees"

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 304(c) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 974(c)), is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (39 U.S.C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this subsection shall not be deemed to be an

equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary, immediately prior to the effective date of this subsection, is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this title in the next lower rate of the appropriate level in such schedule. As used in this subsection, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"(d) Section 204(b) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as

amended (39 U.S.C. 964(b)), is amended by striking out 'thirty' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(e) This title shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

#### "TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

##### "Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

##### "Salary increase for employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 203; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
	\$3,310	\$3,405	\$3,500	\$3,595	\$3,690	\$3,785	\$3,880
GS-1	3,310	3,405	3,500	3,595	3,690	3,785	3,880
GS-2	3,605	3,700	3,795	3,890	3,985	4,080	4,180
GS-3	3,845	3,940	4,035	4,130	4,230	4,335	4,440
GS-4	4,105	4,200	4,305	4,410	4,515	4,610	4,725
GS-5	4,405	4,500	4,605	4,710	4,815	4,920	5,035
GS-6	4,895	5,000	5,105	5,210	5,315	5,420	5,535
GS-7	5,430	5,535	5,640	5,745	5,850	5,955	6,065
GS-8	5,965	6,070	6,175	6,280	6,385	6,490	6,595
GS-9	6,525	6,630	6,735	6,840	6,945	7,050	7,155
GS-10	7,085	7,190	7,295	7,400	7,505	7,610	7,715
GS-11	7,665	7,770	7,875	7,980	8,085	8,190	8,295
GS-12	8,080	8,185	8,290	8,395	8,500	8,605	8,710
GS-13	10,785	10,890	10,995	11,100	11,205	11,310	11,415
GS-14	12,380	12,485	12,590	12,695	12,800	12,905	13,010
GS-15	13,920	14,025	14,130	14,235	14,340	14,445	14,550
GS-16	15,470	15,575	15,680	15,785	15,890	15,995	16,100
GS-17	16,760	16,865	16,970	17,075	17,180	17,285	17,390
GS-18	19,000						

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such Act, as amended.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-

third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 and by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary

"Class 1	\$17,510	\$17,990	\$18,470	\$18,950	\$19,430	\$19,910	\$20,390
Class 2	15,110	15,470	15,830	16,190	16,550	16,910	17,270
Class 3	12,710	13,070	13,430	13,790	14,150	14,510	14,870
Class 4	10,795	11,095	11,395	11,695	11,995	12,295	12,595
Class 5	8,875	9,175	9,475	9,775	10,075	10,375	10,675
Class 6	7,315	7,555	7,795	8,035	8,275	8,515	8,755
Class 7	6,115	6,295	6,475	6,655	6,835	7,015	7,195
Class 8	5,160	5,340	5,520	5,700	5,880	6,060	6,240

"(c) The second sentence of section 415 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 870) is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum rates of

"Class 1	\$12,830	\$13,210	\$13,590	\$13,970	\$14,350		
Class 2	11,905	12,235	12,565	12,895	13,225		
Class 3	10,935	11,245	11,555	11,865	12,175		
Class 4	9,915	10,225	10,535	10,845	11,155		
Class 5	8,955	9,260	9,565	9,870	10,175	\$10,480	
Class 6	8,385	8,620	8,855	9,090	9,325	9,560	
Class 7	7,820	8,055	8,290	8,525	8,760	8,995	
Class 8	7,255	7,490	7,725	7,960	8,195	8,430	
Class 9	6,690	6,925	7,160	7,395	7,630	7,865	
Class 10	6,125	6,360	6,595	6,830	7,065	7,300	
Class 11	5,560	5,795	6,030	6,265	6,500	6,735	
Class 12	5,000	5,235	5,470	5,705	5,940	6,175	
Class 13	4,440	4,675	4,910	5,145	5,380	5,615	
Class 14	3,880	4,115	4,350	4,585	4,820	5,055	
Class 15	3,320	3,555	3,790	4,025	4,260	4,495	
Class 16	2,760	2,995	3,230	3,465	3,700	3,935	
Class 17	2,200	2,435	2,670	2,905	3,140	3,375	
Class 18	1,640	1,875	2,110	2,345	2,580	2,815	
Class 19	1,080	1,315	1,550	1,785	2,020	2,255	
Class 20	520	755	990	1,225	1,460	1,695	
Class 21		1,975	2,210	2,445	2,680	2,915	
Class 22		1,745	1,980	2,215	2,450	2,685	

"(d) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the step rates provided by section 412 or section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such section 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

##### "Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 4103(b) of title 38 of the United States Code, prescribing the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$19,580' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$21,345'.

Increase Act of 1958, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and (D) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this title or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

##### "Employees subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946

"SEC. 203. (a) The third sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended by striking out '\$19,250' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$19,800'.

"(b) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$17,510	\$17,990	\$18,470	\$18,950	\$19,430	\$19,910	\$20,390
Class 2	15,110	15,470	15,830	16,190	16,550	16,910	17,270
Class 3	12,710	13,070	13,430	13,790	14,150	14,510	14,870
Class 4	10,795	11,095	11,395	11,695	11,995	12,295	12,595
Class 5	8,875	9,175	9,475	9,775	10,075	10,375	10,675
Class 6	7,315	7,555	7,795	8,035	8,275	8,515	8,755
Class 7	6,115	6,295	6,475	6,655	6,835	7,015	7,195
Class 8	5,160	5,340	5,520	5,700	5,880	6,060	6,240

staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1	\$12,830	\$13,210	\$13,590	\$13,970	\$14,350		
Class 2	11,905	12,235	12,565	12,895	13,225		
Class 3	10,935	11,245	11,555	11,865	12,175		
Class 4	9,915	10,225	10,535	10,845	11,155		
Class 5	8,955	9,260	9,565	9,870	10,175	\$10,480	
Class 6	8,385	8,620	8,855	9,090	9,325	9,560	
Class 7	7,820	8,055	8,290	8,525	8,760	8,995	
Class 8	7,255	7,490	7,725	7,960	8,195	8,430	
Class 9	6,690	6,925	7,160	7,395	7,630	7,865	
Class 10	6,125	6,360	6,595	6,830	7,065	7,300	
Class 11	5,560	5,795	6,030	6,265	6,500	6,735	
Class 12	5,000	5,235	5,470	5,705	5,940	6,175	
Class 13	4,440	4,675	4,910	5,145	5,380	5,615	
Class 14	3,880	4,115	4,350	4,585	4,820	5,055	
Class 15	3,320	3,555	3,790	4,025	4,260	4,495	
Class 16	2,760	2,995	3,230	3,465	3,700	3,935	
Class 17	2,200	2,435	2,670	2,905	3,140	3,375	
Class 18	1,640	1,875	2,110	2,345	2,580	2,815	
Class 19	1,080	1,315	1,550	1,785	2,020	2,255	
Class 20	520	755	990	1,225	1,460	1,695	
Class 21		1,975	2,210	2,445	2,680	2,915	
Class 22		1,745	1,980	2,215	2,450	2,685	

"(b) Section 4103(c) of such title, prescribing the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$18,480' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$20,145'.

"(c) Section 4103(d) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$17,380' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$18,945'; and

"(2) by striking out '\$14,545 minimum to \$16,500 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$15,855 minimum to \$17,985 maximum'.

"(d) Section 4103(e) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of



Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$13,920 minimum to \$15,230 maximum'; and

"(2) by striking out '\$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$12,380 minimum to \$13,685 maximum'.

"(e) Section 4103(f) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of \$13,920 minimum to \$15,230 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of \$12,380 minimum to \$13,685 maximum a year.

"(f) Section 4107 of such title, relating to the maximum and minimum rates of annual salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, the Dental Service, and the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

*"Medical service*

"Chief grade, \$13,920 minimum to \$15,230 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$12,380 minimum to \$13,685 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$10,785 minimum to \$12,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$9,080 minimum to \$10,390 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,665 minimum to \$8,975 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$7,095 minimum to \$8,075 maximum.

*"Dental service*

"Chief grade, \$13,920 minimum to \$15,230 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$12,380 minimum to \$13,685 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$10,785 minimum to \$12,090 maximum.

"Full grade, \$9,080 minimum to \$10,390 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,665 minimum to \$8,975 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$7,095 minimum to \$8,075 maximum.

*"Nursing service*

"Assistant Director, \$9,080 minimum to \$10,390 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$7,665 minimum to \$8,975 maximum.

"Full grade, \$6,525 minimum to \$7,505 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,675 minimum to \$6,720 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,825 minimum to \$5,870 maximum.

*"Administration*

"(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of physicians, dentists, and nurses."

"(g) Section 4108(d) of such title, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine

and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person, rated as a medical, surgical, or dental specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 per centum of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed \$17,440 per annum."

*"Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees*

"Sec. 205. (a) The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(b) (1) Section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) This Act shall apply to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), subject to the following requirements:

"(1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this Act with respect to such employees;

"(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to accept the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee with respect to service, for purposes of this Act, rendered by such employees prior to the effective date of this amendment; and

"(3) Service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment as an employee of a county committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be included in computing length of creditable service for the purposes of this Act only (A) if the employee has to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this Act (including service allowable under this amendment) and (B) if, within two years after the effective date of this amendment, the employee shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary during the period of service claimed under this paragraph if during such period he had been subject to this Act."

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of this subsection shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

"(c) Section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall, under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, come within the purview of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons."

"(d) Section 3 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) may, in such manner and under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, enroll in an approved health benefits plan described in section 4 either as an individual or for self and family, under the same terms and conditions as apply to other employees who are eligible to enroll in such a plan under this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons."

*"Employees in the judicial branch*

"Sec. 206. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 107(a)(6) of the Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2206(a)(6)), are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 202 of this title in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this title.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '\$7,095' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$7,735'.

*"Employees in the legislative branch*

"Sec. 207. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 9 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on July 1, 1960, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the Presiding Officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief

Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 9 per centum.

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$8,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of \$17,900 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law. This paragraph shall not apply to employees whose rates of compensation are subject to the limitations provided by the amendments made by subsections (g) and (h) of section 207 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960."

"(e) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 9 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

"(g) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (69 Stat. 505; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended (1) by striking out '\$8,040 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized for grade 16 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended', (2) by striking out '\$8,460 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized for grade 17 of the General Schedule of such Act', and (3) by striking out '\$8,880 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the General Schedule of such Act'.

"(h) (1) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60f), is amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That no salary shall be fixed under this section at a basic rate of more than \$5,100 per annum, except that (1) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided by the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, (2) the salary of one other employee may be fixed at a basic rate

which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided for grade 17 of such schedule, and (3) the salary of one other employee may be fixed at a basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided for grade 16 of such schedule'.

"(2) The basic clerk hire allowance of each Senator is increased by \$1,020.

"(1) The basic compensation of the Administrative Assistants to the Speaker, Majority Leader, Minority Leader, Majority Whip, and Minority Whip, and of the Administrative Assistant to any Member of the House who has served as Speaker of the House, shall be at a per annum basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, is equal to the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(j) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended (1) by striking out '\$8,880' where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,' and (2) by striking out '\$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(k) (1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Clause 28(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended (A) by striking out '\$8,880' where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,' and (B) by striking out '\$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(1) Each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 9 per centum of the rate of his total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

"(m) The limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective

date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 9 per centum. The amount of each such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(n) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

#### "TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### "Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

##### "Effective date

"SEC. 302. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1960."

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment in the reported bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, for the present, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the committee amendment.

Mr. MORRISON (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment in the reported bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON as a substitute to the committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### "TITLE I—SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

##### "Part A—Postal field service employees

##### "Short Title

"SEC. 101. This part may be cited as the 'Postal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

##### "Postal Field Service Schedule

"SEC. 102. The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301(a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (72 Stat. 145, 215; 39 U.S.C. 971(a)), is amended to read as follows:

Level	Per annum rates and steps							Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	\$3,415	\$3,545	\$3,675	\$3,805	\$3,935	\$4,065	\$4,195	11	\$7,560	\$7,820	\$8,080	\$8,340	\$8,600	\$8,860	\$9,120
2	3,670	3,805	3,940	4,075	4,210	4,345	4,480	12	8,320	8,605	8,890	9,175	9,460	9,745	10,030
3	3,955	4,100	4,245	4,390	4,535	4,680	4,825	13	9,160	9,470	9,780	10,090	10,400	10,710	11,020
4	4,345	4,505	4,665	4,825	4,985	5,145	5,305	14	10,075	10,410	10,745	11,080	11,415	11,750	12,085
5	4,665	4,765	4,925	5,085	5,245	5,405	5,565	15	11,075	11,440	11,805	12,170	12,535	12,900	13,265
6	4,975	5,150	5,325	5,500	5,675	5,850	6,025	16	12,205	12,570	12,935	13,300	13,665	14,030	14,395
7	5,370	5,555	5,740	5,925	6,110	6,295	6,480	17	13,505	13,870	14,235	14,600	14,965	15,330	15,695
8	5,790	5,995	6,200	6,405	6,610	6,815	7,020	18	15,165	15,525	15,885	16,245	16,605	16,965	17,325
9	6,255	6,480	6,705	6,930	7,155	7,380	7,605	19	16,585	16,945	17,305				
10	6,870	7,110	7,350	7,590	7,830	8,070	8,310	20	17,200						



## "Rural Carrier Schedule

"Sec. 103. (a) The Rural Carrier Schedule contained in section 302(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(a)), is amended to read as follows:

## "RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

## "Per annum rates and steps

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:								Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.	\$71						
Fixed compensation per annum.....	\$2,053	\$2,132	\$2,211	\$2,290	\$2,369	\$2,448	\$2,527	For each mile of route over 30 miles.	24						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	71	73	75	77	79	81	83	Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
For each mile of route over 30 miles.	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay..	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:															
Fixed compensation per annum.....	2,053														

"1 Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier."

"(b) Section 302(c) of such Act, as amended (69 Stat. 119, 72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972 (c)), is amended by striking out '\$5,165 during the period referred to in section 304(c) or \$5,035 thereafter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for a route sixty-one miles in length'.

## "Fourth-class office schedule

"Sec. 104. The Fourth-Class Office Schedule contained in section 303(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 973(a)), is amended to read as follows:

## "FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps							Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
\$1,300 to \$1,499.99.....	\$2,979	\$3,078	\$3,177	\$3,276	\$3,375	\$3,474	\$3,573	\$250 to \$349.99.....	\$1,242	\$1,282	\$1,322	\$1,362	\$1,402	\$1,442	\$1,482
\$500 to \$1,299.99.....	2,730	2,820	2,910	3,000	3,090	3,180	3,270	\$200 to \$249.99.....	993	1,025	1,057	1,089	1,121	1,153	1,185
\$600 to \$899.99.....	2,234	2,309	2,384	2,459	2,534	2,609	2,684	\$100 to \$199.99.....	745	769	793	817	841	865	889
\$350 to \$599.99.....	1,737	1,794	1,851	1,908	1,965	2,022	2,079	Under \$100.....	495	511	527	543	559	575	591

## "Related Provisions Covering Postal Field Service Employees

"Sec. 105. (a) Section 304(c) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 974(c)), is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (39 U.S.C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section."

"(c) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary, im-

mediately prior to the effective date of this subsection, is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this part in the next lower rate of the appropriate level in such schedule. As used in this subsection, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"(d) This part shall have the same force

and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

## "Part B—Government employees generally

## "Short Title

"Sec. 111. This part may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

## "Salary Increase for Employees Subject to Classification Act of 1949

"Sec. 112. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 203; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade		Per annum rates							"Grade		Per annum rates						
GS-1	GS-2	GS-3	GS-4	GS-5	GS-6	GS-7	GS-8	GS-9	GS-10	GS-11	GS-12	GS-13	GS-14	GS-15	GS-16	GS-17	GS-18
\$3,185	\$3,290	\$3,395	\$3,500	\$3,605	\$3,710	\$3,815	\$3,920	\$4,025	\$6,995	\$7,160	\$7,325	\$7,490	\$7,655	\$7,820	\$7,985		
3,500	3,605	3,710	3,815	3,920	4,025	4,130	4,235	4,340	7,560	7,820	8,080	8,340	8,600	8,860			
3,760	3,865	3,970	4,075	4,180	4,285	4,390	4,495	4,600	8,955	9,215	9,475	9,735	9,995	10,255			
4,040	4,145	4,250	4,355	4,460	4,565	4,670	4,775	4,880	10,635	10,895	11,155	11,415	11,675	11,935			
4,345	4,510	4,675	4,840	5,005	5,170	5,335	5,500	5,665	12,210	12,470	12,730	12,990	13,250	13,510			
4,830	4,995	5,160	5,325	5,490	5,655	5,820	5,985	6,150	13,730	14,055	14,380	14,705	15,030				
5,355	5,520	5,685	5,850	6,015	6,180	6,345	6,510	6,675	15,255	15,515	15,775	16,035	16,295				
5,885	6,050	6,215	6,380	6,545	6,710	6,875	7,040	7,205	16,530	16,790	17,050	17,310	17,570				
6,435	6,600	6,765	6,930	7,095	7,260	7,425			18,500								

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at

the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic

compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such Act, as amended.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of

1955 and by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and (D) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he

leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this title or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of

the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

**"Employees Subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946"**

"Sec. 113. (a) The third sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended by striking out '\$19,250' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$19,800'.

"(b) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1....	\$17,250	\$17,650	\$18,050	\$18,450	\$18,850	\$19,250	\$19,650	-----	Class 5....	\$8,755	\$9,055	\$9,355	\$9,655	\$9,955	\$10,255	\$10,555	-----
Class 2....	14,900	15,255	15,610	15,965	16,320	16,675	17,030	-----	Class 6....	7,215	7,455	7,695	7,935	8,175	8,415	8,655	-----
Class 3....	12,535	12,890	13,245	13,600	13,955	14,310	14,665	-----	Class 7....	6,035	6,215	6,395	6,575	6,755	6,935	7,115	-----
Class 4....	10,645	10,945	11,245	11,545	11,845	12,145	12,445	-----	Class 8....	5,085	5,265	5,445	5,625	5,805	5,985	6,165	\$6,345'

"(c) The second sentence of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870) is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum rates of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1.....	\$12,655	\$13,030	\$13,405	\$13,780	\$14,155	-----	Class 12.....	\$4,495	\$4,650	\$4,805	\$4,960	\$5,115	\$5,270	\$5,425	-----		
Class 2.....	11,740	12,065	12,390	12,715	13,040	-----	Class 13.....	4,010	4,165	4,320	4,475	4,630	4,785	4,940	-----		
Class 3.....	10,785	11,095	11,405	11,715	12,025	-----	Class 14.....	3,550	3,705	3,860	4,015	4,170	4,325	4,480	-----		
Class 4.....	9,780	10,090	10,400	10,710	11,020	-----	Class 15.....	3,325	3,440	3,555	3,670	3,785	3,900	4,015	-----		
Class 5.....	9,025	9,285	9,545	9,805	10,065	\$10,325	-----	Class 16.....	3,095	3,175	3,255	3,335	3,415	3,495	3,575	-----	
Class 6.....	8,270	8,500	8,730	8,960	9,190	9,420	-----	Class 17.....	2,860	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	-----	
Class 7.....	7,515	7,745	7,975	8,205	8,435	8,665	-----	Class 18.....	2,640	2,720	2,800	2,880	2,960	3,040	3,120	-----	
Class 8.....	6,760	6,990	7,220	7,450	7,680	7,910	-----	Class 19.....	2,410	2,490	2,570	2,650	2,730	2,810	2,890	-----	
Class 9.....	6,005	6,235	6,465	6,695	6,925	7,155	-----	Class 20.....	2,180	2,260	2,340	2,420	2,500	2,580	2,660	-----	
Class 10.....	5,300	5,490	5,680	5,870	6,060	6,250	\$6,440	-----	Class 21.....	1,950	2,030	2,110	2,190	2,270	2,350	2,430	-----
Class 11.....	5,000	5,155	5,310	5,465	5,620	5,775	5,930	-----	Class 22.....	1,720	1,800	1,880	1,960	2,040	2,120	2,200	-----

"(d) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the step rates provided by section 412 or section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such section 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

"Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

"Sec. 114. (a) Section 4103(b) of title 38 of the United States Code relating to the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$19,580' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$21,050'.

"(b) Section 4103(c) of such title, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$18,480' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$19,870'.

"(c) Section 4103(d) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$17,380' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$18,685'; and

"(2) by striking out '\$14,545 minimum to \$16,500 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$15,640 minimum to \$17,740 maximum'.

"(d) Section 4103(e) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$12,770 minimum to \$13,970 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$13,730 minimum to \$15,030 maximum'; and

"(2) by striking out '\$11,355 minimum to \$12,555 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$12,210 minimum to \$13,510 maximum'.

"(e) Section 4103(f) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and

Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of \$13,730 minimum to \$15,030 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of \$12,210 minimum to \$13,510 maximum a year.

"(f) Section 4107(a) of such title, relating to the maximum and minimum rates of annual salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, the Dental Service, and the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

**"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales"**

"(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

**"Medical Service"**

"Chief grade, \$13,730 minimum to \$15,030 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$12,210 minimum to \$13,510 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$10,635 minimum to \$11,935 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,955 minimum to \$10,255 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,560 minimum to \$8,860 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,995 minimum to \$7,985 maximum.

**"Dental Service"**

"Chief grade, \$13,730 minimum to \$15,030 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$12,210 minimum to \$13,510 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$10,635 minimum to \$11,935 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,955 minimum to \$10,255 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$7,560 minimum to \$8,860 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,995 minimum to \$7,985 maximum.

**"Nursing Service"**

"Assistant Director, \$8,955 minimum to \$10,255 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$7,560 minimum to \$8,860 maximum.

"Full grade, \$6,435 minimum to \$7,425 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,600 minimum to \$6,630 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,760 minimum to \$5,790 maximum.

**"Administration"**

"(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of physicians, dentists, and nurses.

"(g) Section 4108(d) of such title, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person, rated as a medical, surgical, or dental specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 per centum of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed \$17,200 per annum."

**"Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee Employees"**

"Sec. 115. (a) The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(b) (1) Section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) This Act shall apply to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), subject to the following requirements:

"(1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this Act with respect to such employees;

"(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to accept the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee with respect to service, for purposes of this Act, rendered by such employees prior to the effective date of this amendment; and



"(3) Service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment as an employee of a county committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be included in computing length of creditable service for the purposes of this Act only (A) if the employee has to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this Act (including service allowable under this amendment) and (B) if, within two years after the effective date of this amendment, the employee shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary during the period of service claimed under this paragraph if during such period he had been subject to this Act."

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of this subsection shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund."

"(c) Section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall, under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, come within the purview of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons."

"(d) Section 3 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) may, in such manner and under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, enroll in an approved health benefits plan described in section 4 either as an individual or for self and family, under the same terms and conditions as apply to other employees who are eligible to enroll in such a plan under this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons."

#### "Employees in the Judicial Branch"

"SEC. 116. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 107(a)(6) of the Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2206(a)(6)), are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 612 of this part in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section

with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this part."

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '\$7,095' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$7,630'."

#### "Employees in the Legislative Branch"

"SEC. 117. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law)."

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on July 1, 1960, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given."

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the Presiding Officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 7.5 per centum."

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$8,800 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of \$17,525 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law."

"(e) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7.5 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation."

"(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a)."

"(g) Each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and it is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 per centum of the rate of his total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section."

"(h) The limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 7.5 per centum. The amount of each such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent."

"(i) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following)."

#### "Part C—General Provisions"

##### "Authorization of Appropriations"

"SEC. 121. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and title II."

##### "Effective Date"

"SEC. 122. The foregoing provisions of this title and the provisions of section 201 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1960."

#### "TITLE II—EXECUTIVE AND SUPERGRADE POSITIONS"

"SEC. 201. The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 be amended as follows:

"(1) Section 106(a) is amended by adding the following new subparagraph after subparagraph (45):

"(46) Legal adviser, solicitor, or general counsel of an executive department (excluding the Department of Justice)."

"(2) Section 106(b) is amended by deleting the present subparagraph (9) and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(9) General counsel of a military department."

"SEC. 202. There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the classified civil service, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary shall prescribe, and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$19,000."

"SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (b) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out 'fourteen hundred and twenty-nine' and inserting 'fourteen hundred and nine', (2) by striking out 'three hundred and seventy-one' and inserting 'three hundred and sixty-three', and (3) by striking out 'one hundred and fifty-three' and inserting 'one hundred and fifty-two'."

"(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(1) The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized, subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by this Act, to place a total of two positions in grade 18, ten positions in grade 17, and thirteen positions in grade 16 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

Mr. MORRISON (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the rest of it is, just briefly?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman had remained here during general debate he would have heard it. It was debated for 2 hours, and we told exactly what was in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard it all right, but it was kind of difficult to understand the way you put it.

Mr. MORRISON. I will try to do better next time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the Committee's time. I am sure they have heard everything contained in this substitute amendment. It in effect changes the amount of the pay raise from 9 percent across the board to 7.5 percent across the board salary raise for all Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] as a substitute to the committee amendment.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion comes too late.

The Committee will rise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the Chairman could explain that, why it is too late, under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion is in order only when amendments are in order, and under the rule amendments are not now in order.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Boggs, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 537, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 9883, to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with instructions to report it back forthwith with a salary increase for those covered under the bill of 5 percent in lieu of the increase provided in the amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there can be only a straight motion to recommit on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The rule specifically provided otherwise. The rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 94, nays 324, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—94

Abbott	Fisher	Mumma
Abernethy	Flynt	Nelsen
Alexander	Ford	O'Konski
Alger	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Allen	Gary	Pilcher
Andersen,	Goodell	Pillion
Minn.	Griffin	Poage
Andrews	Haley	Poff
Arends	Halleck	Ray
Avery	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Baker	Harrison	Rees, Kans.
Barry	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, N.H.	Herlong	Robison
Bates	Hess	St. George
Bennett, Fla.	Hiestand	Scherer
Berry	Hoeven	Schneebell
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Short
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Sikes
Budge	Jackson	Siler
Brynes, Wis.	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Keith	Smith, Miss.
Chamberlain	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kitchin	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	Lafare	Teague, Calif.
Dague	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Langen	Thomson, Wyo.
Devine	Latta	Tuck
Dorn, S.C.	McCulloch	Westland
Dowdy	McIntire	Wharton
Downing	McMillan	Whitten
Elliott, Pa.	Matthews	Winstead
Everett	Meador	

NAYS—324

Adair	Blatnik	Burke, Mass.
Addonizio	Blitch	Burleson
Albert	Boggs	Byrne, Pa.
Alford	Boland	Cahill
Anderson,	Bolling	Canfield
Mont.	Boiton	Cannon
Anfuso	Bonner	Casey
Ashley	Bosch	Celler
Ashmore	Bow	Chelf
Aspinall	Bowles	Chenoweth
Auchincloss	Boykin	Chipperfield
Ayres	Brademas	Church
Bailey	Bray	Clark
Baldwin	Breeding	Coad
Baring	Brewster	Coffin
Barr	Brock	Cohelan
Barrett	Brooks, La.	Collier
Bass, Tenn.	Brooks, Tex.	Conte
Baumhart	Broomfield	Cook
Becker	Brown, Ga.	Cooley
Beckworth	Brown, Mo.	Corbett
Belcher	Broyhill	Cramer
Bennett, Mich.	Burke, Ky.	Cunningham

Curtin	Karsten	Powell
Curtis, Mass.	Karth	Preston
Daddario	Kasem	Price
Daniels	Kastenmeier	Prokop
Davis, Ga.	Kearns	Pucinski
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Quile
Dawson	Kelly	Quigley
Delaney	Keogh	Rabaut
Dent	Kilday	Rains
Denton	Kilgore	Randall
Derounian	King, Calif.	Reuss
Diggs	King, Utah	Rhodes, Pa.
Dingell	Kirwan	Riehlman
Dixon	Kluczynski	Riley
Donohue	Knox	Rivers, Alaska
Dooley	Kowalski	Roberts
Dorn, N.Y.	Kyl	Rodino
Doyle	Landrum	Rogers, Colo.
Dulski	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Dwyer	Lankford	Rogers, Mass.
Edmondson	Lennon	Rogers, Tex.
Elliott, Ala.	Lesinski	Rooney
Evins	Levering	Roosevelt
Fallon	Libonati	Rostenkowski
Farbstein	Lindsay	Roush
Fascell	Lipscomb	Rutherford
Feighan	McCormack	Santangelo
Fenton	McDonough	Saund
Fino	McDowell	Saylor
Flood	McFall	Schenck
Flynn	McGinley	Schwengel
Fogarty	McGovern	Scott
Foley	McSweeney	Selden
Forand	Macdonald	Shelley
Forrester	Machrowicz	Sheppard
Fountain	Mack	Shipley
Frazier	Madden	Simpson
Friedel	Magnuson	Sisk
Fulton	Mahon	Slack
Gallagher	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Garmatz	Marshall	Smith, Iowa
Gathings	Martin	Spence
Gavin	Mason	Springer
George	May	Staggers
Gialmo	Marrow	Steed
Gilbert	Metcalf	Stratton
Glenn	Meyer	Stubblefield
Granahan	Michel	Sullivan
Grant	Miller, Clem	Teller
Gray	Miller,	Thomas
Griffiths	George P.	Thompson, La.
Gross	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Gubser	Milliken	Thompson, Tex.
Hagen	Mills	Thornberry
Halpern	Minshall	Toll
Hargis	Mitchell	Tollefson
Harmon	Moeller	Trimble
Harris	Monagan	Udall
Hays	Montoya	Ullman
Healey	Moore	Utt
Hébert	Moorhead	Vanik
Hechler	Morgan	Van Pelt
Hemphill	Morris, N. Mex.	Van Zandt
Hogan	Morrison	Vinson
Hollifield	Moss	Wainwright
Holland	Multer	Wallhauser
Holt	Murphy	Walter
Holtzman	Murray	Wampler
Horan	Natcher	Watts
Hosmer	Nix	Weaver
Huddleston	Norblad	Weis
Hull	Norrell	Whitener
Ikard	O'Brien, Ill.	Widnall
Inouye	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wier
Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams
Jarman	O'Hara, Mich.	Willis
Jennings	O'Neill	Wilson
Jensen	Oliver	Withrow
Johansen	Osmers	Wolf
Johnson, Calif.	Ostertag	Wright
Johnson, Colo.	Pelly	Yates
Johnson, Md.	Perkins	Young
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Younger
Jones, Ala.	Philbin	Zablocki
Jones, Mo.	Pirnie	Zelenko
Judd	Porter	

NOT VOTING—14

Barden	Durham	Moulder
Bentley	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Rivers, S.C.
Burdick	Loser	Taylor
Carnahan	Morris, Okla.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Burdick.



Mr. JENNINGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 40, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

#### YEAS—378

Abbott	Daddario	Hull
Abernethy	Dague	Ikard
Adair	Daniels	Inouye
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Irwin
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Jarman
Alexander	Dawson	Jennings
Alford	Deaney	Jensen
Andersen, Minn.	Dent	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Mont.	Denton	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews	Derounian	Johnson, Md.
Anfuso	Devine	Johnson, Wis.
Ashley	Diggs	Jonas
Ashmore	Dingell	Jones, Ala.
Aspinall	Dixon	Judd
Auchincloss	Donohue	Karsten
Avery	Dooley	Karth
Ayres	Dorn, N.Y.	Kasem
Bailey	Dowdy	Kastenmeier
Baker	Downing	Kearns
Baldwin	Doyle	Kee
Baring	Dulski	Keith
Barr	Dwyer	Kelly
Barrett	Edmondson	Keogh
Barry	Elliott, Ala.	Kilday
Bass, N.H.	Elliott, Pa.	Kilgore
Bass, Tenn.	Evins	King, Calif.
Bates	Fallon	King, Utah
Baumhart	Farbstein	Kirwan
Becker	Fasell	Kitchin
Beckworth	Feighan	Kluczynski
Belcher	Fenton	Knox
Bennett, Fla.	Fino	Kowalski
Bennett, Mich.	Fisher	Kyl
Betts	Flood	Lafore
Blatnik	Flynn	Landrum
Blitch	Fogarty	Lane
Boggs	Foley	Langen
Boland	Forand	Lankford
Bolling	Forrester	Latta
Bolton	Fountain	Lennon
Bonner	Frazier	Lesinski
Bosch	Frelinghuysen	Levering
Bow	Friedel	Libonati
Bowles	Fulton	Lipscomb
Boykin	Gallagher	McCormack
Brademas	Garmatz	McCulloch
Bray	Gary	McDonough
Breeding	Gathings	McDowell
Brewster	Gavin	McFall
Brock	George	McGinley
Brooks, La.	Gialmo	McGovern
Brooks, Tex.	Gilbert	McMillan
Broomfield	Glenn	McSweeney
Brown, Ga.	Goodell	Macdonald
Brown, Mo.	Granahan	Machrowicz
Brown, Ohio	Grant	Mack
Broyhill	Gray	Madden
Burke, Ky.	Griffiths	Magnuson
Burke, Mass.	Gubser	Mahon
Burleson	Hagen	Mailliard
Byrne, Pa.	Haley	Marshall
Cahill	Halpern	Martin
Canfield	Hardy	Mason
Cannon	Hargis	Matthews
Casey	Harmon	May
Celler	Harris	Meador
Chamberlain	Hays	Merron
Chelf	Healey	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hébert	Meyer
Chipperfield	Hechler	Michel
Church	Hemphill	Miller, Clem
Clark	Henderson	Miller,
Coad	Herlong	George P.
Coffin	Hess	Muller, N.Y.
Cohelan	Hiestand	Milliken
Collier	Hoeven	Mills
Conte	Hoffman, Ill.	Minshall
Cook	Hogan	Mitchell
Cooley	Hollifield	Moeller
Corbett	Holland	Monagan
Cramer	Holt	Montoya
Cunningham	Holtzman	Moore
Curtin	Horan	Moorhead
Curtis, Mass.	Hosmer	Morgan
	Huddleston	Morris, N.Mex.

Morrison  
Moss  
Multer  
Mumma  
Murphy  
Natcher  
Nelsen  
Nix  
Norblad  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N.Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Oliver  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Pirnie  
Porter  
Powell  
Preston  
Price  
Prokop  
Pucinski  
Quie  
Quigley  
Rabaut  
Rains  
Randall  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richman  
Riley  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts

Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rutherford  
St. George  
Santangelo  
Saund  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Schneebell  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Selden  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Shipley  
Sikes  
Siler  
Simpson  
Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Miss.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Teller

Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Thornberry  
Toll  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Udall  
Ullman  
Utt  
Vanik  
Van Felt  
Van Zandt  
Vinson  
Wainwright  
Wallhauser  
Walter  
Wampler  
Watts  
Weaver  
Wels  
Westland  
Wharton  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wier  
Williams  
Willis  
Wilson  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolf  
Wright  
Yates  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki  
Zelenko

#### NAYS—40

Alger  
Allen  
Arends  
Berry  
Budge  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cederberg  
Colmer  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dorn, S.C.  
Everett  
Flynt  
Ford  
Griffin

Gross  
Halleck  
Harrison  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Jackson  
Johansen  
Jones, Mo.  
Kilburn  
Laird  
McIntire  
Murray  
Norrell  
Pilcher  
Pillion

Poage  
Poff  
Ray  
Reece, Tenn.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Scherer  
Short  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Va.  
Taber  
Tuck

#### NOT VOTING—14

Barden  
Bentley  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Carnahan

Durham  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Loser  
Morris, Okla.

Moulder  
Patman  
Rivers, S.C.  
Taylor

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, just prior to the vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill

(H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1863)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 31, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$68,827,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$32,053,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$32,553,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$55,220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,515,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$940,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$31,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,488,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "one hundred seventy four thousand and seven hundred and thirty six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "eighty-seven thousand and three hundred and sixty-eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$67,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4 and 6.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
FRED MARSHALL,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
H. CARL ANDERSEN,  
JOHN TABER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
LISTER HILL,  
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the

action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Research: Appropriate \$68,827,200 instead of \$67,934,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,247,600 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes the following increases above the funds approved by the House:

(1) \$500,000 for research on spray residues, making a total of \$750,000 additional for this purpose;

(2) \$250,000 for utilization research, making a total increase of \$950,000 for this purpose;

(3) A total of \$272,500 for advance staffing of the cotton insect research laboratory and for additional research at three branch stations;

(4) \$60,000 for initial staffing of two corn insect laboratories authorized last year;

(5) \$350,000 for increased vegetable crops research;

(6) \$75,000 for the Newell, S. Dak., research station;

(7) \$20,000 for research on weeds of sugarcane at Houma, La.;

(8) \$25,000 for pecan insect research at Albany, Ga.;

(9) \$25,000 for research studies on salt cedars and other phreatophytes;

(10) \$60,000 to increase poultry disease research at Athens, Ga.;

(11) \$455,700 for staffing soil and water laboratories, which provides a total of \$40,000 for the Humboldt River watershed in Nevada and \$200,000 to expand research on hydrology problems in Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 3—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates \$52,236,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$52,011,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Special fund: Restores House language stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to recede and agree to the sum of \$2,550,000 instead of \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to provides funds for various research facilities as follows:

(1) \$300,000 for initiating construction of the main laboratory and headquarters at the National Arboretum at a total cost of not to exceed \$1,500,000;

(2) \$250,000 for tobacco research facilities as provided in the House bill;

(3) \$900,000 for planning and initiating construction of a facility at Athens, Ga., at not to exceed a total cost of \$950,000 to conduct research on diseases and related problems affecting poultry;

(4) \$200,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of \$400,000 at Mississippi State University to conduct research in management and structures in relation to the prevention and control of disease and related methods of improving poultry quality in the Southeast;

(5) \$300,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of \$2,000,000 at or near the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station at Fargo, N. Dak., for research on metabolism of agricultural chemicals in insects, plants, and livestock, and to develop sterility techniques for control of insects;

(6) \$250,000 for research facilities on improved practices for conservation farming and ranching at Bushland, Tex., as provided in the House bill;

(7) \$200,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed

a total cost of \$400,000 to conduct basic research on tillage, traction, and transport equipment and its effect on soil conservation at Auburn, Ala.;

(8) \$250,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of \$850,000 to develop technology for sound conservation practices in the Snake River Valley;

(9) \$350,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of \$500,000 to conduct research on plants, soil, and nutrition at Ithaca, N.Y.;

(10) \$150,000 for construction of a laboratory to study soil and water management practices of the Northwest at Pullman, Wash.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—State experiment stations: Appropriate \$32,553,000 instead of \$31,553,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,553,708 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Extension service

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate \$56,715,000 instead of \$55,715,000 as proposed by the House and \$57,715,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have eliminated from the bill the requirement that the use of the additional funds be limited to the county level. The conferees are in accord, however, that such increase should be used in accordance with such provision. A number of States have used the substantial increases made in this item in recent years for additional personnel at the State and county levels. Many of these States have failed to maintain the salaries of county agents at a level comparable with agents in other States. In such States the funds in this bill should be used for the present number of employees at the county level to place salaries at a level comparable with other States. Testimony before the House committee indicates that salary increases are needed in 22 States to maintain comparable levels.

Amendment No. 12—Retirement costs for extension agents: Appropriates \$5,961,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Federal Extension Service: Appropriates \$2,265,000 instead of \$2,255,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,275,000 as proposed by the Senate. The extra \$10,000 is provided for the employment of an additional auditor.

#### Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 14—Watershed protection: Appropriates \$35,000,000 instead of \$32,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that \$4,900,000 shall be used for investigations and planning.

Amendment No. 15—Flood prevention: Inserts statutory reference.

#### Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 16—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriates \$16,515,000 instead of \$16,315,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,605,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes funds to initiate lamb-on-feed reports, research on vegetables in the Southeast, and a pilot operation on estimates for tomatoes and celery. The conferees agree that the full \$750,000 allowed by the House should be used to initiate the long-range program designed to modernize and improve the entire system of agricultural estimates.

Amendment No. 17: Changes punctuation.

Amendment No. 18—Marketing services: Appropriates \$26,579,900 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have allowed the full budget estimate for poultry inspection. The funds so approved are for poultry inspection as proposed by the budget.

The conferees have agreed to an increase for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act in view of the Department's in-



creased regulatory responsibilities over livestock transactions at country points. However, concern has been expressed by livestock producers, country buyers, and local sales operators regarding the possible imposition of administrative regulations on selling and buying practices at the farm or local level which perhaps are appropriate for the larger markets but which are completely contrary to long-established and accepted customs, arrangements, and practices by parties at interest. It is the consensus of the conferees that vast differences have prevailed and will continue to prevail between sales by private treaty or at local community sales and transactions at the organized public and terminal markets. For this reason care should be exercised in the development of applicable regulations governing livestock transactions to provide for meeting these different situations in order that the right and freedom of producers to negotiate, bargain, and decide in their best interests shall be protected.

#### Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$4,487,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,447,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize the transfer of \$2,539,000 from section 32 funds as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,493,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—Special foreign currency program: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate relative to the purchase of foreign currencies.

#### Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$940,000 instead of \$930,000 as proposed by the House and \$941,325 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Commodity Stabilization Service

Amendment No. 23—Conservation reserve program: Appropriates \$330,000,000 instead of \$310,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$335,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the funds included for administrative expenses, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be used for county expenses. Reductions required under the balance of the administrative funds shall be made primarily at the Washington level.

#### Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 24—Loan authorizations: Authorizes \$60,000,000 for the contingency fund for each program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$31,050,000 instead of \$30,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$31,467,650 as proposed by the Senate and authorize the transfer of \$1,050,000 from the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Office of Information

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, 29, and 30—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$1,488,000 instead of \$1,478,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,523,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for the printing of 174,736 copies of the 1961 yearbook "Seeds" and the reprinting of 87,368 copies of the 1959 yearbook "Food."

#### Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 31—Limitation on administrative expenses: Authorizes \$45,726,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$44,726,000 as proposed by the House, which provides an additional \$1,000,000 for the contingency fund. The conferees are in agreement that cotton-quality evaluation and other research to be performed under CCC contracts should not be charged to this limitation. They further agree that all such

research undertaken in fiscal year 1961 should be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate when initiated and should be provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1962.

Amendment No. 32—Limitation on administrative expenses: Eliminates language inserted by the House. The conferees have eliminated the following language from the bill: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities, consistent with the economical operation of the Corporation.

The charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation states: "That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall limit the duty of the Corporation, to the maximum extent practical consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, to utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities and arrangements of the trade and commerce in warehousing commodities \* \* \*." The conferees agree that commercial warehouse space for storing commodities be given preference, other things being equal; however, when existing Government storage is available and can be effectively used at less cost, taking into consideration all cost factors involved, including risk incurred, such space should be used in the interest of protecting the Treasury. Such practices as moving commodities from existing Government storage into commercial warehouse space is certainly not in the interests of protecting the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation and is a waste of tax dollars. The conferees do not favor construction of further Government-owned storage facilities.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,

FRED MARSHALL,

CLARENCE CANNON,

H. CARL ANDERSEN,

JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am a little concerned about one sentence in the report, the very last sentence which says that the conferees do not favor construction of further Government-owned storage facilities.

I would like to cite as the background for my question the fact that last year, the first year of the Benson corn program, we produced 4.4 billion bushels of corn. We consumed 3.8 billion bushels. Obviously the CCC is obligated under these circumstances to take over a considerable amount of corn. There is some doubt there is sufficient properly located storage in existence today, even when you add the commercial together with the Government-owned storage. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation must secure some additional storage somewhere. If they cannot secure the storage at a reasonable price

from the trade, obviously they are going to have to or should provide it with some Government-owned facilities.

In order to make the language in the report more clear, did the gentleman intend to discourage the construction of more Government-owned storage under these circumstances, or where it is necessary?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] offered the amendment commonly known as the Yates amendment. I think he rendered a real service in offering that amendment. I think it was beneficial to the conferees in writing the conference report. Generally we have tried to carry out the intent of that amendment in our report, as I understand the intent, though the conference language speaks for itself.

As to the language to which the gentleman refers, I call attention again to the fact that we did not say government storage could not be built. We said only that we did not favor the construction of further Government-owned storage facilities. The intent, as I understand it, was that where commercial facilities can be made available or where the Government can promote the construction by commercial enterprise, on a reasonable cost basis, in those cases it should be done. But I do agree with the gentleman that under the price-support laws storage space must be made available in order to provide for the price-support program. In those cases where storage is not otherwise available the CCC would be duty bound to use this means of providing the price support benefits. Thus we come back to the fact that if commercial enterprises do not meet this need on a reasonable basis, there would be an obligation on the part of the Government to meet it. We do not favor doing that unless it should be necessary either because commercial warehousing was unavailable or because exorbitant rates were demanded.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Let me first thank the gentleman for his gracious comments on my amendment. I am still not clear as to what the meaning of the language used by the conferees is. I read from the conference report:

The conferees agree that commercial warehouse space for storing commodities be given preference, other things being equal.

Suppose you have two facilities in an area. You have a Government-owned facility and you have a commercial facility, both of which are empty. It would be cheaper to store the surplus commodity in the Government facility. Is it the intent of your amendment that the Commodity Credit Corporation should store such grain as requires storage in the Government facility under those conditions?

Mr. WHITTEN. If we presume that it would be more economical to use the Government storage, it is our intent that it be used. We do point out in the language we use that there are certain cost

factors that should be taken into consideration in making the decision as to "most economical." The commercial warehouse agrees to deliver the same quality grain without deterioration. On the other hand, the Government under some circumstances might have no provision for loading and unloading and no provision for turnover. That in itself would not preclude Government-owned storage, but in determining which is most economical those different factors should be taken into account. Primarily what we say in the report is what I think the gentleman really intended in his amendment. We spell out some of the factors which are involved in the word "economical."

Mr. YATES. That was the intent of the amendment, to make the program be operated in the most economical way possible, and that is still the intent of the conference report, that the program be operated on the most economical basis possible, and that if the corporation has a choice between commercial and Government facilities and it would be more economical to use the Government facilities, the corporation is to use the Government facilities.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my belief that would be required under the words of the charter, "Consistent with the efficient operation of the corporation." May I say the gentleman's efforts, I believe, will lead to considerable savings to the Government.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Has the action of the conferees been discussed with the officials of the Department of Agriculture having to do with the storage of grain, and do they think that this compromise arrangement is reasonably satisfactory from the standpoint of the farmer, the warehouse man, and others involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not discussed this with the Department officials. We had quite lengthy hearings with the departmental officials earlier. This in my judgment is in line with the sound operation of the corporation. I do not believe anybody in the Department could differ with the language. After all, the Department's handling of the matter led to the adoption first of the amendment and now of the report. I think it is in line with what sound-thinking people in the Department believe, and I think it is thoroughly workable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conference committee on their splendid report and to say that I appreciate their cooperation in having the funds for marketing services restored in the bill. As I told the House on May 11, the elimination of the appropriations for Federal compulsory poultry inspection would have a serious impact on the important poultry industry of the First Congressional District of Maryland. Members of the committee assured me that efforts would be made to restore these funds

amounting to some \$26 million, and I am happy that this has been accomplished.

We are proud of our Eastern Shore poultry industry. Our producers have remarkably increased their efficiency in the use of inputs in feed, labor, capital, and management, which have resulted in lower production costs. Our breeders and hatcheries have provided improved meat-type strains, and our processors have adopted modern methods and techniques. Collectively, the industry has promoted its products in the Nation's marketplace. In spite of these economies and good market practices, the margin of profit to the poultry industry has been reduced to the point where further investments in capital assets have been questioned.

For the past year, I have been pressing for more favorable freight rates on feed ingredients shipped from midwestern grain terminals to our district. Freight rates to other geographic areas of the same distance or more which produce poultry are for the most part considerably lower than those prevailing in my district. This inequity and discrimination is definitely unfair to the poultrymen on the Delmarva Peninsula. As an example, the Memphis area was at a \$1.97 a ton advantage over our poultry district. A study is now under way on freight price differential in the northeast area and I see some hope that our great poultry industry will obtain this needed relief.

Another problem confronting the great Delmarva poultry-producing area is the need to deepen channels and improve harbor facilities in order to take advantage of cheaper water freight rates.

The Eastern Shore is one of the largest broiler-producing areas in the United States. Despite higher feed ingredient costs, higher freight rates, and higher operation costs generally, our poultry industry has held a respectable position because of its high degree of efficiency, good management, and quality birds. This great industry is and will continue as an important segment of the general economy of the district.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, when the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill was on the floor, I offered an amendment to require the Commodity Credit Corporation to use Government storage facilities to the maximum extent possible, consistent with economical operation of the Corporation, for the storage of surplus agricultural commodities. The reason for the amendment was obvious. As the committee pointed out, the storage charges for fiscal year 1959 totaled almost \$482 million. For 1960, the storage charges for surplus commodities were estimated to be \$612 million. For the next fiscal year, storage charges were expected to exceed \$700 million. The Government itself owns fa-

cilities in which 985 million bushels of surplus commodities can be stored. According to the committee's hearings, these facilities are being used only to the extent of 65 percent.

Why is this important? Because of the great disparity between the costs of storage in Government facilities and commercial facilities. According to the hearings, the cost of using Government facilities is 5.1 cents per bushel as opposed to a cost of 16.3 cents per bushel in commercial facilities. And even with this tremendous difference in cost, it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture to require storage in commercial bins, even though empty Government storage space is available. It is clear that millions of dollars in storage charges can be saved if Government facilities are used to a greater extent.

Now the conferees have returned with their conference report which has stricken the amendment I offered in the House and which the House accepted. I know that the conferees had a most difficult task in trying to reconcile their support for the Yates amendment with the views in opposition of the Senate. However, after speaking to several of them earlier today on the intent of the language in the conference report which was substituted for my amendment, I believe its intent is the same. The language may be different, but the purpose is the same.

The purpose of the Yates amendment was to save money for the taxpayers through the efficient and economical operation of the Corporation's storage program. It had been shown that the Corporation was not making adequate use of Government facilities. On the contrary, it was utilizing much more expensive commercial facilities, when Government storage facilities were available. As I indicated before, the hearings of this subcommittee and of the Fountain Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations show that the cost of storage was 5.1 cents for Government facilities, as opposed to 16.3 cents for commercial storage. No one on this subcommittee—not even those who objected to the Yates amendment when it was proposed, took issue with these costs when they were considered in committee.

In view of the statements just made by the chairman of the subcommittee that it is the intention of the conferees that the storage program be operated on the most economical basis, it would seem to me that the new language in the conference report must be construed to require practices which encourage economy. If Government facilities and commercial facilities are both available, and it is more economical to store the surplus commodities in Government facilities, I understand it to be the intention of the conferees that the commodities should be stored in Government warehouses. If in fact it can be shown that it is more economical to store the commodities in commercial facilities, the commodities should be stored in commercial facilities.

I have been assured by the chairman that the subcommittee intends to review the storage practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the next fiscal



year to see whether it will abstain from the extravagant practices of which it has been guilty in the past. I have been assured further that the committee intends to make sure that Government facilities are utilized in a manner which will permit the storage program to be operated as efficiently and economically as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Yates amendment is a common sense amendment. The taxpayers are entitled to the protection it contains. I am sure the farmers themselves want the taxpayers to have such protection so that the entire farm program is not jeopardized by unnecessary and unwarranted expenditures. I am sure that they do not intend that the farm price-support program be a storage price-support program, as well. Common sense dictates that such costs be kept to a minimum. Common sense should be used in administering the surplus commodity storage program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to commend and compliment the leadership and those advocating the measure for the speed with which the pay-raise legislation for Government employees was brought to the floor and approved.

Just a few days ago a discharge petition was filed, and the Members stood in line in the well of the House to sign, and in 2 days the required number of signatures was obtained.

The pay-raise measure that we have approved has merit, and in addition it has popular appeal for more than 2 million Government employees. But what about the farmers, Mr. Speaker? Are American farmers any less deserving of their day in court?

It should be noted that the lowest entrance salary for civil service employees is now \$2,960. That is a rather low salary today with the high cost of living and industrial wages averaging more than \$90 per week. So we have just agreed to give all Government employees with salaries ranging from \$2,960 to \$17,500 a year a substantial raise. I believe they deserve it or I assure you I would not have voted for the bill.

But what about our farmers whose average net income per family is only \$2,380 per year? The average farm operator and family today earns for labor, investment, and management ability a total amount \$580 a year less than the lowest paid civil service employee to whom we have just voted a raise.

Two-thirds of the American farms, about 3 million of them, had incomes from farming last year amounting to \$3,000 or less, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The average return to the dairy-farm operators and their families in the Central Northeast is below the present minimum civil service salary. The average return to cotton-farm operators in the southern Piedmont is only a fraction of that, and the average return to wheat-farm operators is also below the mini-

mum civil service salary. They, too, must live off their dollar income like anybody else.

Are farm families any less deserving of consideration at our hands than the families of Government employees?

An income-reducing wheat bill was approved in the other body just the other day by a vote of 44 to 36 after an amendment sponsored by the majority to reduce price supports another 5 percent below the committee bill had been approved by a record vote of 48 to 34. Wheat farmers were shocked last week by the action in the other body and all farmers are appalled by the lack of any action here in the House of Representatives.

I am told that the Committee on Rules, with an 8 to 4 membership dominated by Democrats, has still not acted on the pending bill. I repeat, I am told that the Committee on Rules, with an 8 to 4 membership, dominated by Democrats, has still not acted on the pending farm bill. But I do not see the advocates of farm legislation, of that particular bill, filing a discharge petition, nor do I see the majority in control of the Congress by virtually a 2-to-1 margin doing anything about the farm-income problem.

On the one hand we see this quick and decisive action on behalf of 2 million Government employees, with salaries ranging from \$2,960 to \$17,500 a year, and on the other hand we see nothing being done—nothing being done for the 3 million farm families with incomes at or below the minimum civil service salary.

When I plead for action on a worthwhile farm measure, the leaders in control of legislation alibi that it might be vetoed. But the threat of a possible veto did not dismay a great majority of our colleagues here today when they signed the discharge petition earlier and now have cast their votes for a civil service pay raise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that motion and make a point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are not interested in farm legislation, that is their business. If their lack of order indicates their lack of interest in farm problems, let the record speak for itself. I am merely expressing my opinion here today in behalf of the farmers of the Nation. If some Members are not concerned, that is their business. That is about what the Democratic majority has done this year; they have not listened and they have not acted. They have that bill bottled up in the Rules Committee. They are waiting until the wheat bill comes over from the Senate and then they will say that our corn and feed grain green acres proposal is not germane because the bill would be wholly limited to wheat. That will be their strategy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about the Rules Committee and our friends on the right over here. I was not thinking of them; I would like to hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is talking about the Rules Committee.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I am just criticizing the Rules Committee, eight Democrats and four Republicans, for lack of action. We have been here more than 5 months, adjournment is staring us in the face with the turn of the page of our calendar, and campaign promises to the farmer apparently have been forgotten. The time for action on farm legislation is long overdue, Mr. Speaker. The House has just shown the Nation how fast it can act when the majority decides to do so, with little or no concern for a threatened veto.

Mr. Speaker, there is no alibi left for the dismal failure of this Congress in the field of farm legislation. The last, lame excuse of a possible veto was swept aside by the action of the House today in passing the pay raise bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 5, insert "Provided, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1962 that does not require minimum matching by any State of at least 40 per centum;"

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 1962 in said amendment insert "1963".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 6, line 1, insert:

#### "CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES"

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, \$3,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$300,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for payment of expenses for construction of a headquarters-laboratory building at the National Arboretum, which is hereby authorized to be constructed under contract authorization in an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

**"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES**

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, \$2,550,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely gratified that, in accepting the conference report on the agriculture appropriations bill, the House of Representatives today included the sum of \$150,000 for the establishment of a soil and water conservation research laboratory facility at Washington State University at Pullman.

This facility, one of five authorized for construction in fiscal year 1961, will enable scientists to cope with an acute erosion problem which is causing the loss of soil at an alarming rate, particularly in the rolling Palouse hills near Pullman where much of our Northwest wheat is grown.

As I pointed out in testimony before the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I have heard from a great number of individuals and interested farm organizations who believe, as I do, that a special laboratory for soil and water conservation research should be established within the State of Washington, and that it should be in harmony with the comprehensive report on "Facilities Needs—Soil and Water Conservation Research," the report of findings by the working group appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Within the State of Washington, our most urgent need is to expand materially Federal efforts in soil and water research.

I wish to commend the House and Senate for its action in approving this facility.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

**JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE**

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12620) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code

to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 1959, the House passed H.R. 7577, a bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes. This bill was the culmination of much thought and serious consideration after full and complete hearings were held by the Judiciary Committee and all interested governmental departments were heard. All departments were generally in harmony in approving the nature and purpose of such legislation.

That bill was then passed by the Senate with an amendment in which the House concurred so that legislation, long sought and much needed, would not be deferred and on the further premise that the amendment by the other body is applicable only to the procedural aspects of the bill and not to the essence of the proposed legislation.

On June 11, 1960, H.R. 7577, as amended by the Senate, was vetoed by the President who in his veto message stated, among other things:

This amendment is unfortunate.

And:

Although unwilling, therefore, to approve this bill, I would gladly sign new legislation corresponding to H.R. 7577 as first passed by the House of Representatives.

H.R. 12620 is identical in every respect with H.R. 7577 which, before amendment, was pleasing and acceptable, in the main, by all interested parties who are concerned with the matters covered thereby, pondered the problems and considered their solutions and, as indicated in the veto message, was also acceptable to the President. I wish to express my appreciation to the Members of this House who, I hope, will give unanimous consent to its passage as it indicates that the Members are alert to speedy action when the need is evident and the merit of legislation is apparent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof and (2) by adding immediately following such subsection (a) as hereby so designated, four new subsections as follows:*

*"(b) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of this title for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the em-*

*ployee or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim.*

*"(c) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any employee of the Government or his estate for any such damage or injury. The employee against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the head of his department to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleadings and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought, to the Attorney General, and to the head of his employing Federal agency.*

*"(d) Any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of this title and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (b) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.*

*"(e) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677, and with the same effect."*

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to be in effect six months after the enactment hereof but any rights or liabilities then existing shall not be affected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY**

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has been reported that we might come in early tomorrow to consider the foreign handout bill and an effort will be made to rush it through in 1 day. Will the gentleman enlighten me as to whether there will be any attempt made to come in early tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to follow this request with another one that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock. Whether we get through in 1 day or not is something I cannot foretell. I want to frankly advise the gentleman in response to his inquiry what my intentions are.

Mr. GROSS. I might say that if we do come in early tomorrow it would seem to me that would be an invitation to ram the bill through in 1 day. I am opposed



to that, and I would be constrained to object to any request to come in early.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to the gentleman from Iowa that I appreciate his frankness. The gentleman says if I make the unanimous-consent request to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow he will object, is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall not make the request in view of the fact that my friend has so frankly advised me.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have called special executive sessions of the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations to begin next Tuesday, June 21, to take testimony regarding contracts let by the Post Office Department.

Information which the Department provided to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service indicates that the Department may be circumventing the law regarding consultant services. The law sets a maximum limit of \$100 per day which can be paid to individual consultants by the Department; however, by making contracts with consulting firms, the Department has been able to pay at much higher rates.

For instance, the Department has paid one firm \$400 per day, for 71 days, for the services of a survey director; and from \$125 to \$250 a day for associates. They were supposed to be studying "the effect of postal services and the impact of postal rates and fees on the users of the mail."

It is obvious, from such outlandish rates of pay for management consultant surveys, that the whole Post Office Department contract system must be thoroughly investigated by the Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for the

Treasury and Post Office Departments, that if the facts are as stated by him the meeting of our subcommittee scheduled for next Tuesday is very much in order.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman, and I will say that so far as the facts are concerned they are recorded. If there is any reasonable explanation the Post Office Department will have an opportunity to make it. Personally, I cannot see how there can be any.

#### D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM CHARTER AND SIGHTSEEING OPERATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 525 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order, with 2 hours of general debate, the bill entitled "To insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation here is that some years ago, several years ago, in fact, Congress granted a monopoly of mass transportation to the Capital Transit System. Some time ago my attention was called to the situation which prevailed with respect to sightseeing transit where it appears that the Capital Transit Corp., not satisfied with the monopoly on mass transportation, is now seeking through the use of its facilities, to also engage in a situation with respect to sightseeing buses, and to run out of business these numerous little corporations that operate sightseeing facilities here in the District. They are doing it because of the fact that under their charter they are granted certain privileges and immunities by reason of their charter on mass transportation. They are using those privileges and immunities in order to drive the little sightseeing people out of business. I do not think that ought to be permitted. For instance, they have a certain provision in their

charter which relieves them of the gasoline tax, which is quite a considerable item in the matter of the expense of operation of both mass operation and sightseeing transportation. Now, the sightseeing corporation, the little fellow, does not have that tax exemption of their gasoline. The transit system is using its mass transportation facilities, such as buses, help, and so forth, in the operation of this effort to drive the little people out of business.

I think the situation should be corrected. The committee having jurisdiction of this matter is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They went into the matter at considerable length with the Public Utility Commission and with others interested, including the mass transportation company itself. They came up with the proposal that the mass transportation company, which is the Capital Transit Co., should be prohibited from exercising this right to use its mass transportation facilities with the objective of destroying the small business people who are engaged in the sightseeing business. That is the sole object of the bill. It is very brief.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Under the strike settlement of some years ago the Capital Transit Co. was given certain privileges in operating its buses and streetcars, privileges having to do with the gasoline tax, among other things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WIER. I am told that the company has no intention of exercising those privileges of using untaxed gasoline in its chartered buses. They have two kinds of buses, sightseeing buses and buses which are chartered for these large groups that come to Washington and want certain bus service. I am told that they do not enjoy that privilege as to those buses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am informed that they not only enjoy them but exercise them to the fullest. I may have been misinformed, but the gentleman who held the hearings on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee can advise the gentleman better than I can on that subject.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, although I understand there is some opposition to the bill itself, I know of no opposition to the rule. I have no requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4815, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill H.R. 4815 with the recommendation that it be approved. This bill, as was stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in his statement on the rule, provides that all assets and personnel of the D.C. Transit System of the District of Columbia used in providing mass transportation service shall be so used exclusively and shall not be used in any other service in competition with the service of any other company.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, was introduced and sponsored by our colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS]. He has given a great deal of study to it and will amplify the statement and explain further the costs. However, I should like to give you a little of the background from my own experience with the problem.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. How extensive were the hearings before the gentleman's committee on this legislation, and were the organized operators and workers on the D.C. Transit System permitted to testify, and did they testify?

Mr. HARRIS. The hearings were quite extensive and, as the gentleman will see by observing the printed hearings, the organization referred to by the gentleman from West Virginia did have ample opportunity and did testify at some length.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The subcommittee under the direction of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], held extensive hearings on this subject. The subcommittee did a good job in developing the record. The full committee considered the bill at some length in executive session. I will get back to the bill after I give you the background of this problem.

I would not want by what I am about to say to have anyone think I am not going to vote for the bill. The committee voted this bill out of committee and reported it to the House by an overwhelming vote. I feel somewhat obligated to support the committee in its action in view of the fact that as chairman at that time I did not take an adverse position under the circumstances. So regardless of what I am about to say, I am going to support the bill.

I think probably there is some merit in the contention of the sponsors and those who are interested in it.

This is a fight primarily and principally between the D.C. Transit Co. sightseeing and charter operation and the Gray Lines sightseeing and charter operation. It goes back to 1956 and prior to that time, when we had over a period of at least 2 or 3 years a terrific

argument in this Congress over the D.C. Transit operation.

If you will recall back to 1953 or 1954 along in there, there was a request and urgency that we in the Congress approve a \$20 million operation of a Federal Government transit operation for the District of Columbia. I was one of those who were opposed to that program. A majority of the District Committee, of which I was a member at that time, were likewise opposed to it. Under the leadership and direction of the then chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], we adopted what I believe could be referred to as stopgap legislation for a period of a year or 2 years until we could have time to resolve the question.

Then the District Commissioners came up with their proposal to take over the D.C. Transit business and operate it with funds appropriated out of the Federal Treasury, the sum of about \$20 million, and that went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I, of course, was at that time a member of this committee also, and our late beloved friend Percy Priest at that time was chairman of the committee. We had quite a lengthy controversy and consideration. Finally, we came up with a plan to give a franchise to the present management, as they had offered to buy or purchase from the former management the transit system for the District of Columbia. Under that contract they had to purchase the D.C. Transit operation. We gave to the present D.C. Transit Co. a franchise. That franchise has a provision in it, I think it is section 6, whereby the transit company could continue or have the privilege to engage in sightseeing and charter operations. That is part of the franchise. The former company, Capital Transit Co., operated a limited service of charter and sightseeing operation. The old company did not engage to any extent in sightseeing and charter business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What I want to do is keep the record completely straight on this. The gentleman said the sightseeing and charter provision was a privilege in the previous franchise that was held by the Capital Transit Co.

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have never seen that franchise, and if my recollection serves me correctly it was never found out that there was any specific provision granting that to the former transit company. No one has ever produced it for me to see, even at the time that we were having the meeting in committee. I would like to see that provision if it is available.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand it is part of the old franchise or so interpreted. That is the reason this was included in the new franchise in 1956 as it was considered to be in the old franchise. The gentleman can get that. It is a matter of record.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman would tell me where it is, I would

love to see it, because I have hunted for it and have been unable to find it, and the staff has been unable to find it for me. I have requested it in the last 3 weeks and I have not found it. If the gentleman will recall, the matter was discussed in the joint committee that handled this situation of which both you and I were members. If I could see it, I would like to see it.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman will recall that during the course of the hearings on this bill it was discussed. They had this privilege before, and they had engaged only to the extent of about \$40,000 a year in such business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It was determined at that time, so far as the record shows, that it was a matter of surference and was not a specific grant of a franchise. If there is any difference in that I would like to see the record on it, but I have not seen it yet.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is as familiar with the record of the hearings as I am, and I am trying to relate the facts as they happened. If there is any question about the present franchise, I refer you to section 6 of the franchise itself which specifically authorizes it in the act of 1956. The gentleman has that and he is familiar with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the provision that was placed in this present franchise which is in existence today. What I am referring to is the previous franchise held by the Capital Transit Co., which was a Wolfson enterprise.

Mr. HARRIS. The hearings developed that the Wolfson group operated sightseeing and charter business to the extent of only about \$40,000 a year.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Now that is the fact—they were not engaged to any extensive degree, but when the present management, under the franchise of 1956, took over, they started to increase the operation of sightseeing and charter business. In doing so they became competitive with the other smaller sightseeing operators in the metropolitan area. What they have done in doing this is to use their equipment in competition with the regular sightseeing and charter business.

In other words, they would take the personnel and equipment and put them on during the rush hours of the day, that is, the early morning and the late afternoon, and then during the other part of the day they would use the same equipment and the same personnel in their sightseeing and charter business.

In this kind of operation, and I emphasize it, the present D.C. Transit operation now is engaged to the extent of some \$600,000 a year. Similar lines, the Gray Line and others around here, in their competitive situation claim that it is an unfair advantage and by their using personnel which they have to pay for anyway and equipment which they have to maintain anyway they virtually



operate it without additional cost and therefore can competitively put them out of business.

That is simply the argument that we have, that is the whole question.

We asked the Commissioners to deal with this problem, and I think under present law they can. The Commissioners failed to assume the responsibility that we thought they had and deal with the problem.

We reported this bill out last year. At the same time we adopted the resolution requiring that the Commissioners give us a report on the problem with the understanding that we would not file the report with the House until we had received this interim report. We were unable to get an interim report until the first part of this year, sometime about January February, or even later, I am not sure just when. But at that time they submitted a voluminous report and about all it said was that they were not in position to do anything about it, that they were not taking a tax advantage, that they had looked over their method of competition as it is explained in the report, how they arrived at the tax base, and so forth. Consequently they said that under the circumstances they were not going to do anything about it. Therefore, the question still remains unsolved.

Then we held up the report trying to work it out an even longer period of time, but nothing could be done. Therefore, I had no alternative except to file this report with the House and to consider it; and that is the sole question we have here today: Whether or not D.C. Transit System under the franchise of 1956 may now continue to operate a sightseeing and charter business with the same equipment and same personnel it uses in its regular D.C. Transit operations. This bill says they cannot do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was asked a question about exemptions. I would like to set the record straight. I quote from the testimony of Mr. James H. Flanagan, vice president, comptroller, and treasurer of the D.C. Transit System, Inc. He said at page 207 of the hearings:

The allegation so often made that D.C. Transit System, Inc., is tax-exempt deserves some attention.

Congress did relieve the company from liability for the antiquated gross receipts tax which formerly existed. Other bus companies in this area paid a 1-cent tax per mile of operation within the District in lieu of the gross-receipts tax. Congress has now relieved these other companies from liability for this 1-cent tax. Therefore, we are all even in this respect, so far as exemption from taxation is concerned.

He further states:

The Commission found that the fuel tax payable by the company for July and August 1958 was \$827.04, and so certified to the District Commissioners. This amount was paid immediately upon presentation of a bill by the District tax collector early in this month of May.

I do not know of any other tax benefit enjoyed by D.C. Transit System, Inc., which

gives it an unfair advantage in its charter and sightseeing operations over any other bus company similarly engaged.

There is indicated here the taxes which they pay, totaling some \$1 million.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the interim report to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on page 11 says:

As hereinbefore indicated, the question of tax advantage under section 8 is of no substantial significance.

During the course of the hearings the attorney for Gray Line, Mr. Arnold, also testified that the tax exemption and the tax question was of no significance in connection with this bill, am I right?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct. This is a fight principally between Gray Line and D.C. Transit. It is a fight between business organizations. What this bill does is to try to tell the head of a business how he can use his equipment and his personnel to his economic advantage or disadvantage. Being one who is interested in maintaining private enterprise I am against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this bill is constitutional. I think it is special legislation; it is in the form of a private bill for the benefit of Gray Line and the other companies who agree with Gray Line.

To show you how discriminatory this bill is, may I quote from the testimony of Walter J. Bierwagen, president, National Capital Local Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, appearing on page 180 as follows:

It should be noted that several competitors of D.C. Transit System for sightseeing and charter work in this area use their mass transportation equipment, assets, and personnel in sightseeing and charter service in the District of Columbia.

These include the Washington, Virginia & Maryland Coach Co., which furnishes mass transportation service in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., and between these points and the District of Columbia. Another competitor for sightseeing and charter work is the Alexandria, Barcroft & Washington Transit Co., which furnishes mass transportation in Alexandria, Va., and between Alexandria and downtown Washington. Another is Washington, Marlboro & Annapolis Transit Co., which furnishes mass transportation service in parts of Prince Georges County, and between points in Prince Georges County and downtown Washington. Still another is Suburban Transit Co., now being operated by Inter-County Transit Corp., which furnishes mass transportation service in parts of Montgomery County, Md., and between points in that county and downtown Washington.

A simple and logical question to be asked is, Why should there be different rules for the use of a company's equipment and personnel?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not true, as is my understanding, in the 1956 franchise this was specifically spelled out as being something that the D.C. Transit Co. should be allowed to do while under the proposal and under this legislation that right would be removed which was granted upon which the present interests in control of D.C. Transit went into the business?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. My recollection of the record is that the gentleman is correct. In fact, the head of D.C. Transit, Mr. Chalk, testified this was a very vital part of his consideration in purchasing D.C. Transit; that is, the fact they would have sightseeing and charter privileges.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is not correct. This does not put the D.C. Transit Co. out of the sightseeing business. It prevents the use of the District of Columbia franchise for the purpose of promoting the sightseeing business. It provides they will have to separate their sightseeing business from their other franchise business.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. If that is the case, this is the first time in mass transportation history that this is being done in the United States, because from available information all charter companies and sightseeing companies that are engaged in mass transportation use their equipment in the manner D.C. Transit is using theirs.

Mr. Chairman, this is an unfair way to legislate. This is a bad bill.

Let us give the Public Utilities Commission of the District the authority and let us jog them into doing the right thing. If the D.C. Transit is not accounting for its revenues properly, that is one thing, but let us not take corrective action which is unconstitutional and discriminatory. The Gray Line is the greatest monopoly there is in the United States so far as sightseeing and charter is concerned. They control about 12,000 hotel rooms in the District of Columbia alone.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, all I know is what I read. On page 6 of the hearings the gentleman from Mississippi stated:

It is apparent that the purpose of the bills is to restrain the transit system from engaging in sightseeing or charter operations.

Now, that is the plain fact. It is there.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I think the effect of this bill would be exactly that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, if they were knocked out at this time, at least a profitable part of this system would be knocked out, and it would almost, of necessity, raise the fares which, it seems to me, are already high enough.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman's point is well taken, because the chairman of the Committee on Legislation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Hon. Kenneth H. Tuggle, said this on

page 5, of the hearings, talking about getting separate equipment for sightseeing:

Such duplication of facilities and restrictions against the interchange of personnel and equipment as between the types of services rendered would of course result in increased costs and possibly have an overall effect of giving rise to a need for increased fares for transit, or "mass transportation," services. The competitive advantage of D.C. Transit's tax exemptions would, however, appear to remain unaffected.

We shall not forget that we have to consider the people of the District of Columbia, their mass transportation system and the effect upon them. I am not worried about the Gray Line, D.C. Transit, or anybody else, but I do not want to pass any pointless legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman stated that this was operated like all other mass transportation systems throughout the country engaging in charter and sightseeing.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I said that this is the modus operandi of mass transportation systems throughout this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does the gentleman have any documentation to support that statement of fact in regard to other cities?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I think you will find it in the record. I think our late departed colleague, Mr. Bush, who used to be in the bus business, asked searching questions about this, and I think the replies brought forth the situation as it exists.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think you will find that this is a very unique situation and that there are only one or two companies in the United States that have any tax exemption coupled with a monopoly. This is a very unique situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to know whether we are going to finish this legislation tonight or what the program is. That is what I want to find out. Will somebody on the majority side tell us? Some of your Members have been coming over here asking us to make a point of no quorum. I know you know how to do that. Are you going to finish tonight or what?

Mr. HARRIS. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the leadership, and at this moment I do not know just what this plan is. I will be glad to try to find out, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Do I understand the gentleman to be saying that this legislation would compel the D.C. Transit Co., if it is to engage in sightseeing and charter operations, to operate in an uneconomical fashion?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. It would do exactly that. It would have to buy new buses if it wanted to transport children from Alexandria to Washington. It could not use the same driver, not the same bus, not use the same man to paint the different signs. It is ridiculous. It certainly does not militate in favor of efficient operation.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman if the record shows anywhere what proportion of the sightseeing and charter business is now enjoyed by D.C. Transit and how much by Gray Lines? How much do the other operators in the District enjoy?

Is there evidence that D.C. Transit is using some favored position to drive others out of business?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. For the last available period Gray Lines showed twice the amount of charter and sightseeing business as did D.C. Transit. But, talking about a monopoly, here are some interesting statistics. Let us look at the wages that these various companies pay. D.C. Transit pays its employees in its sightseeing business \$2.82½ an hour; W.B. & M. pays \$2.65; A.B. & W. \$2.56 an hour; Gray Lines, the main protagonist for this bill \$2.27 an hour; W.M. & A. pays \$1.87 and Suburban Transit pays \$1.74. So that D.C. Transit pays the highest wages.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asked a question a few moments ago about how long we planned to run. I thought under the circumstances we could go until about 5:30. We could get that much of the debate behind us.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, may I say for the edification of the chairman of the committee that I have only one more request for time; this is an indication of how long we will take on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in his usual fair and forthright manner, has presented to you precisely the issue that this legislation brings before the House. During the course of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in his presentation under the rule, he was asked about the facts underlying this legislation and he very properly said that he was stating the facts as they were submitted to him. Without in any way attempting to criticize the gentleman for his statement—and I am sure he presented the facts as they were submitted to him—I say that his presentation is not in accordance with the record. When I talk about the record, I want you to bear in mind that this matter was first presented to the Committee on the District of Columbia. And that is where it belonged. The Committee on the District of Columbia saw fit to take no action. Then it was presented to the Small Business Committee. The Small Business Committee conducted rather lengthy hearings, on

May 12, 16, and 19, 1958. They were printed in two parts, aggregating 208 pages. The Small Business Committee rendered a report on the matter which was subsequently submitted to the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. In his letter of transmittal of August 20, 1958, he said, "I am glad to transmit the report as the report of this committee."

There was no dissent to that report. The report confirmed the fact precisely as stated to you by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], that this legislation is the result of the fight waged by the Gray Lines, the biggest sightseeing company in the country, against D.C. Transit Co., a mass transportation company which also engages in sightseeing operations. Those operations are on a much smaller scale than that of Gray Lines.

The Small Business Committee indicated in its report that the law and the regulations vested with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia ample power to do anything and everything that might need to be done in order to prevent any unfair competition. They can regulate rates, if necessary, and do whatever might be called for in connection with that business to promote and protect the public interest.

There was an effort made throughout those hearings before the Small Business Committee—as there was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] submitted his bill, H.R. 2316, identical with the Rogers bill which is before us here as H.R. 4815—the effort was made to show that there is some tax exemption or advantage given the D.C. Transit Co. that gives it an unfair competitive advantage over all of its competitors. When the facts were adduced at both sets of hearings, at which appeared representatives of the Gray Lines, their lawyers, and others, all concerned—and you will find this in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is before you—that there is no tax consequence here that gives any unfair advantage to anybody.

As a matter of fact, everybody agreed that if D.C. Transit were losing money and therefore would get some tax exemption that might be an advantage to it but that would hurt no competitor. On the other hand if it were making money and paying taxes again no disadvantage accrued against a competitor. All affected had to agree that if there were tax benefits, then the solution was not try to change the D.C. franchise, or to change the law that gave them the franchise. The way to correct the unfairness to the other fellows, small or large, was either to give them the same tax exemptions or to take them away from D.C. Transit Co. We did enact legislation to give such tax exemption to the other sightseeing companies competing with D.C. Transit Co. But there are no taxes and no tax exemptions in this bill.



Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman mentions the Small Business Committee report on this matter. That committee in its report at page 3 stated:

Gray Lines, Inc., is the largest of the sightseeing and bus chartering services in the District of Columbia when measured by volume of business derived from those services. No other operator has as farflung associations and affiliations throughout the country. No other has as many hotels in or out of the District tied up by exclusive contracts. Gray Lines, Inc., alone controls almost 12,000 hotel rooms in the District. Its nearest competitor, the D.C. Transit System, Inc., controls less than 1,500.

Mr. MULTER. Those are the facts that existed then, they are the facts that exist today, and they are the facts as they existed during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If you want to compare size, the Gray Lines in 1957 had a gross income of almost \$1,300,000 and paid taxes and license fees of only \$48,054. Compare that with taxes and fees of \$364,270 paid by D.C. Transit Co. for the same period. During that period the sightseeing service of the D.C. Transit Co. was less than \$500,000.

What is behind this? The facts and the documents before the various committees established beyond any peradventure of a doubt that Gray Lines is trying to use this legislation—and I cast no aspersion on any Member of the House who favors this legislation—to force D.C. Transit Co. to buy them out at an exorbitant price. That is the only reason for this legislation.

Permit me to direct your attention to these facts: The Small Business Committee has recommended against this legislation, the Public Utilities Commission has recommended against it, the District Commissioners have recommended against it, the District of Columbia Committees of both Houses have refused to take any action on it, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, while taking no position on the bill, says that to enact this bill, and I quote from page 5 of the hearings, "would of course result in increased costs and possibly have the overall effect of giving rise to a need for increased fares for transit or mass transportation services."

If you want to see the fares for the District of Columbia populace go up, then enact this bill. I hope you will not do so.

This bill is in fact a private bill which takes from D.C. Transit System, Inc., its charter and sightseeing operations. It does so at the instance of Gray Lines, which is the largest sightseeing operator in the District of Columbia metropolitan area. It deprives D.C. Transit System of its property without due process of law and without compensation.

The technique employed by the bill is bad; the precedent dangerous. The public interest is best served by integrated mass transit and charter and sightseeing service. This is the longtime custom not only here but in practically every comparable community. Under this bill,

other local transit companies may continue in the future, as they have in the past, to perform both operations. Only D.C. Transit and its employees—who will lose work opportunities—are discriminated against.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say something about the Gray Line trying to force D.C. Transit to buy them out?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I should like to read a telegram I have received, because that statement was made to me several times and I made an investigation of it. This is a telegram that was addressed to me. It reads:

This is to inform you that the undersigned and Col. Harry J. Dooley, president, and Miss Jewel Burton, secretary, were approached at least four separate occasions by D.C. Transit officials who sought to obtain the Gray Line franchise in Washington, D.C. The initial request for an appointment came from Morris Fox, first vice president of D.C. Transit, in May 1957. Mr. Fox sent representatives Leonard Wolf and Clayton S. Wells to our Chicago office following the May request. Messrs. Wolf and Wells stated that D.C. Transit had advantages in the sightseeing industry in Washington with which other operators could not compete. They also stated that these advantages were driving the Gray Line in Washington to failure and that D.C. Transit was therefore the logical representative in Washington. Messrs. Wolf and Wells sought to persuade Gray Line Sightseeing Cos., Associated, to transfer the franchise from the present member in the District of Columbia to D.C. Transit. D.C. Transit's proposal was rejected out of hand but subsequent requests were made by D.C. Transit in 1958 and in 1959.

GRAY LINE SIGHTSEEING COS.,  
ASSOCIATED,  
JOHN A. CHAPIN, Vice President.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MULTER. What is the date of that telegram?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is dated June 6, 1960.

Mr. MULTER. May I say to my colleague I have no doubt the telegram was received by him and of course the gentleman quoted it accurately. But I would say to you, sir, and I say to this House that that is a belated effort by them to cover up their real purpose in sponsoring this legislation. I repeat that the testimony adduced before the Small Business Committee on which I then served and still serve established that Gray Lines sought to force D.C. Transit Co., Inc., to buy it out. Those efforts by a representative of the Gray Lines (of Washington—not of Chicago) continued after the filing of the Small Business Committee report on August 20, 1958, and I can personally attest to that fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see where the pressures are coming from with reference to this particular matter. As part of the printed record, we find this memorandum made by the gentleman who was in attendance at a meeting between Mr. Chalk and the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], on July 10, 1958. This is an official memorandum of the conversations

had at that time which are printed as part of the record. This is what the memorandum says, and I quote:

The chairman mentioned that he had hoped some arrangement could be reached whereby the sightseeing business could be surrendered by Mr. Chalk (that is the D.C. Transit Co.), it being understood that he would be compensated therefor in some fashion which was appropriate.

It hardly comes with good grace to follow that with a bill, H.R. 2316, to strip D.C. Transit Co. of its sightseeing business and that without compensation and without due process of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer in a moment to the unconstitutionality of this bill. But, first, I want to call your attention to some further testimony, in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] read from the opening statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], when the hearings got on the way.

The first witness in support of the bill was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. He was asked by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

In looking over these bills, it appears to me that the bills would provide that the transit system be restricted entirely to the transit operations, and not permitted, or not be permitted to engage in any other activity.

Is that the purpose?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] responded:

The bills provide that the corporation shall not use its mass transportation facilities in competitive business. That is what is intended, Mr. Chairman.

In other words, competitive business will be competitive. It will not put them out of business. It will not put the D.C. Transit out of business in any of these businesses, but it will place them on the same plane, with no special advantages.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, if these bills should become law, the D.C. Transit System would enjoy its special statutory tax privileges, insofar as mass transit is concerned, or public transit is concerned. However, in regard to its sightseeing operations and these other operations which you mentioned, it would not receive these tax benefits, but would be placed on exactly the same plane as competing systems.

Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated to you that all the parties involved must agree that there is no tax involvement in this bill. If you read the bill you will see there is not a word mentioned about taxes nor even any reference thereto.

All the bill seeks to do is to take from the D.C. Transit Co. its right to operate its sightseeing services.

As to the unconstitutionality of the bill, you will find on pages 368 and 369 of the printed record an opinion from the Library of Congress. It is fairly

long, but I will quote but one short excerpt from it and will omit the citations to the court decisions. The opinion concludes and I quote:

As property is the sum of all the rights and powers incident to ownership, including the right to control its use, and as confiscation may result from a denial of the "use of property" as well as from a taking of the "title to property," I believe S. 304 is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 304 is the Senate counterpart of the bills H.R. 2316 and H.R. 4815, which is before you now.

There can be no doubt that this is not an attempt to help small business as against big business. This is not an attempt to create tax equality.

This is an attempt to take by so many words and by mention of the company—a right given by the Congress in its franchise to D.C. Transit, Inc. It is an attempt to take out of that franchise without compensation, without due process of law, by, if you please, a bill of attainder, to take from it, a very valuable property right, which it has acquired at the invitation of the Congress and which with its own money it has built up.

Mr. Chairman, we all remember that the transit situation in the District of Columbia was in one awful mess when Mr. Chalk was asked to come in, and he did come in. He took over a company that was inoperative, it was strike bound, it had old obsolete equipment. The service had been the worst in the country. He is now giving us good, clean transit facilities in the District of Columbia; we are getting good service at reasonable fares.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I only want to dwell on one point as to why I believe this legislation is not generally in the public interest as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. There are several hundred pages of testimony in book form. In other words, the hearings were quite complete. The testimony that struck me most forcefully was that which dealt with why it was important for D.C. Transit to engage in the sightseeing business, and that may occur to you also. Why was that necessary? Why is it necessary today?

In the very nature of the transit business you have peaks and valleys in the use of your personnel and in the use of equipment. I think this will be admitted by both sides, that beginning at about 6:30 to 7 o'clock in the morning the peak starts from down at a low level, and it reaches this peak, according to my recollection, between 9 and 10 o'clock in the morning; then it goes down into the valley, which is quite sharp, between the hours of 10 and about 3:30. Now, here is an area, here is a time when there is almost no use of either personnel or equipment. It is this equipment and this personnel that D.C. Transit uses during these valley periods when there is little if any transit business.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will yield; yes.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true that there are many different mass transit companies across the country who are faced with the same problem of peaks and valleys, that do not engage in extra curricular activities? And is it not also true that the D.C. Transit Co.'s fare of 25 cents is about the second highest of any mass transportation system in this country?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman will find if he goes into the thing deeply enough, that there are many transit systems that do engage in it. On the other hand, I will say there is probably an equal number that do not. So to that extent the gentleman is correct.

I remember testimony and the gentleman probably will remember having received telegrams from transit companies over the country who do engage in the sightseeing business during the daytime and who have vested interests, they say, in the retention of the sightseeing business.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for a further observation?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. The point I was trying to make is that there are other mass transportation systems in the country which do not engage in sightseeing or chartered transportation, who are rendering service at fares less than those charged by D.C. Transit and who are still in operation notwithstanding the fact they, too, have problems of peaks and valleys.

Mr. SPRINGER. The problem of peaks and valleys is in any system, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I merely bring it up today as a problem in discussing the cost. This is a very substantial amount. The gross revenue from this, according to my recollection of 2 years ago was about \$520,000 a year.

That is a half million dollars. When you think of a gross revenue of the D.C. Transit System being probably in the neighborhood of \$25 million a year, you can see that this is approximately 3 percent which would be taken away in the form of gross revenue. I believe this is an important property right they have. It is necessary for them to have it if you are to take the best advantage of the equipment and personnel that the company has.

There is just one other thing. There has been one rate increase last year. The D.C. Transit has given notice that if this right is taken away there will be no other alternative except to bring this to the attention of the Public Utilities Commission. I take it that means in case this right is taken from them in the form provided in this bill they intend to come in and ask for another fare increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical matter which the people of the District of Columbia, in my estimation, are immediately faced with and which the Public Utilities Commission of the District of

Columbia will be faced with if this right is taken away in the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I know the gentleman from Illinois has always been a great champion of small business, as is the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who brought that same matter up a few minutes ago about the need for a mass transportation system to have these fringe benefits, so to speak, in order to operate at a profit.

Here is what you are doing when you take that position: You are saying that in order to provide a mass transportation system you have to furnish a corporation with the right to put a bunch of little independent businessmen out of business by undercutting them in every way in order to take over their business as a supplement to the mass transit system. If a subsidy is needed to provide a mass transit system it ought to be paid by all of the people and not by the people who are engaged in sightseeing and in the charter business and in the limousine business which the D.C. Transit Co. is moving into. That is exactly what is being done in this particular situation. They are using the tax exemption, they are using their equipment to undercut these smaller people in the business, including the little fellows at the foot of Capitol Hill and in front of the White House, they are practically putting them out of business. I have some letters I am going to read when my time comes which will show you what is happening to the little people.

Mr. SPRINGER. Here is my answer to the gentleman from Texas: If this sort of thing exists today, as the gentleman contends, then this right should not have been given to them in the first place. It is my belief, and I am not a great constitutional lawyer, in spite of what has been written in here on page 5 with reference to constitutionality, it would appear to me as a former judge, for whatever that title is worth, that there is a serious question of constitutionality when you take away from a company a right which they had at the inception and was vested in them. Now you seek to come along 3, 4, or 5 years later and take the right away without reimbursement. I think it is a question probably of what he is legally entitled to. If he is legally entitled to engage in it, it should have been enforced. That is a question for the future. But I think there is a serious question. This taking away, of course, is going to wind up in the courts anyway.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The matter was brought up about this right by the joint committee when Mr. Wolfson went out of business and the D.C. Transit took over. Mr. Chalk at that time stated in answer to queries by me as to why he wanted to go into the business and he said he wanted to do about what the Capital Transit is doing, which was about \$40,000 a year.

He has taken this situation and he has abused a privilege and a right that was given him in good faith by the Con-



gress. He is putting people out of business. The gentleman spoke about the constitutionality of it. If the Congress granted the right under section 6 of the franchise this is not taken away from him. He still has the right to operate any kind of a charter or sightseeing business he wants to, but he does not have the right to have an unfair advantage over his competitors. This bill would stop that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to express my vigorous opposition to this piece of legislation which, on the face of it, shows it is a violation of the franchise granted by the Congress to the D.C. Transit Co. only 4 years ago. It also brings in the question that it interferes with the bargaining agreement existing now between the D.C. Transit Co. and its several hundred employees here. The hearings disclose that the D.C. Transit Co. is paying as high as 80 cents an hour more than some of these other companies that desire to take over the business or take this business away from the D.C. Transit Co. I am speaking on behalf of the union members of the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Bus Operators and their contract with the D.C. Transit Co. Even if it is only 5 percent, as the gentleman who just preceded me said, that it is going to cost, overall, the D.C. Transit System, it will affect scores of the present employees of the D.C. Transit Co., who will lose their jobs.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The fact of the matter is this, that the people I want to protect by this bill are the people who are small independent business people and who want to work, and they want to work for whomever they choose. But, as this matter turns out, it will not be long that they will not be able to work for anybody except the D.C. Transit people. I have had letters from people that had to give up stands on the corner because of the manner in which this thing has been operating, cutting underneath their prices, increasing the granting of these places for the use of their leads to where these people had to go to work for the D.C. Transit Co.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep concern over this piece of legislation. I am opposed to it and I shall vote against it. My reasons primarily are because—and God forbid that we have another streetcar strike in this community that we had to wrestle with for about 8 months a few years ago—this action on this bill could be a lead in that direction. As most of you know, I come from the city of Minneapolis. Minneapolis has a population of pretty close to 600,000. We have the Twin

Cities Rapid Transit Co. in Minneapolis which serves both Minneapolis and St. Paul, intercity. We also have the independent bus companies there. And the fare for our riding public is 25 cents. I want to say, too, that we would be in a bad way because of the many events we have in the city of Minneapolis if we did not have the facilities of the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. in this very charter and sightseeing bus business. That applies also to the conventions that we have. These little bus lines are not able to take care of the conventions that come to Minneapolis, neither are the taxicabs nor any other mode of transportation able to take care of the Saturday afternoon crowds at big events. The Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. is available to all who want to use the service on any occasion.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Do they separate their physical facilities and their workmen for these two operations?

Mr. WIER. No. The very buses that carry the passengers to work in the morning go out to the baseball game in the afternoon. Our baseball park is quite a little distance outside the limits of Minneapolis; the same with our university football crowds. So, I hope that this bill is defeated.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE ITEM VETO IN THE STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my efforts to convince the Congress that approval of the item veto authority for the President is an important step forward in achieving fiscal stability at the Federal level, I wish to review the history of the item veto as it has been used in the various States.

As you know, I have had my legislative research team at the State University of Iowa studying the item veto issue for over a year, and as a result of this study, I have introduced three joint resolutions as approaches the Congress might use in authorizing its use by the President.

On June 8 I addressed this body on the history of the item veto from the very inception of our Government. Today, I wish to dwell upon the wide use the item veto has had in most of the States. In doing this, I again want to call attention to the research which has made these

remarks possible. The young men working for me at the State University of Iowa, under the direction of Dr. Russell Ross, have done a thorough and noteworthy study. I have had their findings checked by authorities in this field, and have been gratified with the praise which has been directed to the members of the team.

The veto of specific items in appropriation bills is very predominate in State constitutions. At the present time 42 of the 50 States have provisions for the item veto in their State constitutions. These States are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The item veto was first adopted in the United States in the Provisional Constitution of the Confederacy. Article I, section 5 of that document states that—

The President may veto any appropriation or appropriations and approve any other appropriation or appropriations in the same bill.

This was continued in the Permanent Constitution of the Confederacy, which states in article I, section 7, that—

The President may approve any appropriation and disapprove any other appropriation in the same bill. In such case he shall, in signing the bill, designate the appropriations disapproved, and shall return a copy of such appropriations with his objections to the House in which the bill originated and the same proceedings shall then be had as in case of other bills disapproved by the President.

Only North Carolina of the Confederate States does not now have the item veto in its State constitution.

The first two States to adopt the item veto were also in the Confederacy. These were Georgia and Texas, both of which adopted it in 1868. Other early States to adopt it were West Virginia in 1872, Pennsylvania in 1873, Arkansas and New York in 1874, Alabama, Missouri, Nebraska, and New Jersey in 1875, Colorado and Minnesota in 1876, California in 1879, and Illinois in 1884.

State constitutions vary on the majority necessary to override the Governor's veto of an item in an appropriation bill. Thirty of the 42 States require two-thirds majority for overriding. Some require two-thirds of the total membership, some require two-thirds of members present and voting, and others make no definite provision for either. Those requiring two-thirds majorities are Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Those specifying two-thirds of the members present

are Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Those with provisions for two-thirds of the total membership are Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Wyoming. In Alaska vetoed appropriation items become law by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the membership of the legislature.

Six States, Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, have item vetoes which can be overridden by a majority of each house. Alabama, Arkansas, and West Virginia provide for a majority of total membership being necessary, while the others do not further define a majority.

Five States provide for a three-fifths majority. A three-fifths vote of the members present is sufficient in Rhode Island; a three-fifths vote of the members elected, in Delaware, Maryland, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Only one State, Virginia, provides for a different majority for overriding appropriations items than is necessary for overriding vetoes of other bills. A majority is required to override item vetoes, while two-thirds of members present is necessary to override vetoes of bills other than appropriations items. No State allows the veto of items in nonappropriation bills, which are generally required to be limited to one subject which must be expressed in the title of the bill. This provision in many cases gives the Governor and the people some protection, since it makes it impossible for the legislative body to lump two or more subjects together in a given bill. That is why there is less need in the States for an item veto for a nonappropriation bill.

Two States on which a considerable amount of study has been given to the workings and history of the item veto are Illinois and Pennsylvania.

Illinois adopted the item veto in 1883, under Gov. Shelby M. Cullom. Illinois mayors had been given this power in 1875, and an item veto bill narrowly missed being enacted in the 1881 session of the Illinois General Assembly. Governor Cullom advocated it to the assembly in 1883, and it was adopted, 35 to 7, in the State senate and, 107 to 2, in the house of representatives. It was approved by the people by a vote of 428,831 to 60,244 and, therefore, was formally placed as an amendment to the Illinois constitution in 1884.

The amendment stated:

Bills making appropriations of money out of the treasury shall specify the objects and purposes for which the same are made, and appropriate to them, respectively, their several amounts in distinct items and sections; and if the Governor shall not approve any one or more of the items or sections contained in any bill, but shall approve the residue thereof, it shall become law as to the residue in like manner as if he had signed it. The Governor shall then return the bill with his objections to the items or sections of the same not approved by him to the house in which the bill shall have originated, which house shall enter the objections at large upon its journal and proceed to reconsider so much of said bill as is not approved by the Governor. The same proceedings shall be had in both houses in reconsidering the same as is hereinbefore provided in

case of an entire bill returned by the Governor with his objections; and if any item or section of said bill not approved by the Governor shall be passed by two-thirds of the numbers of those elected to each of the two houses of the general assembly, it shall become part of said law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

At first this provision was used very little in Illinois. Between 1884 and 1903, 19 years and nine sessions of the general assembly, the item veto was used only once. In 1899, Governor Turner rejected a \$99,166.61 appropriation for the University of Illinois. Since then, however, there has been a close relationship between the increase in size of State budgets and the more extensive use of the item veto.

Illinois Governors have interpreted liberally the authorization to veto distinct items in appropriation bills. There are two ways in which this was liberally interpreted: Governors have stricken the phrase "per annum" in biennial appropriation bills, and in the reducing of items.

In December 1915, the Illinois Supreme Court in the case Fergus against Russel held that these two liberalizations were unconstitutional. The court also ruled that, since these reductions were unconstitutional and that no outright veto had been made, the entire appropriation should be permitted to stand.

The item veto in Pennsylvania is probably stronger than that of any other State. There the veto power includes the power to reduce any item. No other State has a constitutional provision that will permit this. The Governor may veto a bill within 10 days of passage. If he does not do so, the bill is approved automatically and becomes law unless this 10-day period falls, within 10 days of adjournment of the legislature. Bills passed less than 10 days before the end of the session become law 30 days following adjournment unless they are vetoed. Even though the item veto in Pennsylvania includes the power to reduce items, it does not include the power to veto certain items of nonappropriation bills.

From 1939 to 1946 the Pennsylvania Legislature passed 2,174 bills, of which 229 were vetoed, 330 appropriations were reduced, and 23 appropriations struck out. During all but 2 years of that time both the legislature and the governorship were in the hands of the Republican Party. From 1941 to 1942 the Democratic Party controlled the house of representatives.

Because of the item veto and the reduction power the Governor's budget is enacted into law in much the same form as it is proposed:

[In thousands of dollars]

Session	Governor's budget	Amount passed by legislature	Amount vetoed	Total
1939.....	377,171	386,290	10,225	376,065
1941.....	361,944	408,102	50,990	357,112
1943.....	345,335	383,399	1,695	381,704
1945.....	479,688	538,651	21,808	516,842

Governors of Pennsylvania customarily do not give detailed reasons for vetoes of specific items or reduction in items. Only once has the legislature overrid-

den a veto even though many items have initially passed the legislature by more than the required two-thirds majority. One reason for this is that few bills, and particularly appropriation bills, are passed until the last 10 days of the session. In 1924, 98 percent of all appropriation items of bills vetoed or reduced occurred in the 30-day period following adjournment. In 1945 only 14 of the 224 vetoes and 17 of the 337 item vetoes or reductions reached the legislature before adjournment.

The item veto has been used as a means for breaking deadlocks between the two houses of the legislature. In 1941 the Democratic-controlled house of representatives and the Republican-dominated senate were deadlocked on appropriations. The Republican senate passed an appropriations bill in the same form as the house of representatives "objectionable as some provisions are" and "left it to the Governor's constitutional power to correct such conditions as it can."

The growth of the item veto has been quite spectacular considering that in 92 years 42 States have adopted it. Most States writing new constitutions include it, as did our two newest additions to the Union, Alaska and Hawaii.

Next Wednesday, June 22, I have been granted permission to take the floor again so that I can review the arguments pro and con on the item veto. After the presentation of all of these facts, it is hoped that other colleagues will join me to press for action on this legislation.

#### DR. THOMAS DOOLEY, A MAN OF GOD, A SPLENDID AMERICAN, A DEDICATED DOCTOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the unselfish expression of love for our fellow man occurs with varying frequency in most of our lives. Few of us, however, can boast the daily devotion to humanity of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. His dedication to the task of helping those in need knows no limit and the sacrifice of his personal safety to the cause of helping others to know a better and safer life is an example of human greatness which fills us with awe. I can think of no more fitting recipient of the Lay Churchman Award, and it gives me great pleasure to see the recognition given this great humanitarian by the Religious Heritage of America, Inc.

Dr. Dooley's recent personal tragedy has highlighted for the entire world his tremendous achievements in wiping out disease and sickness in Laos and other countries. Needless to say, Dr. Dooley's courage and devotion to humanity did not originate with his operation for cancer in August of last year. Since 1954, he has struggled against disease in Indochina—first as a Navy physician after



the fall of Dienbienphu and, after his discharge from the Navy in 1956, under the auspices of Medico in setting up his first hospital in Laos.

The magnitude of the challenge which faced Dr. Dooley in Indochina defies our imagination. As he describes it:

These people have always thought that having something wrong with them is natural. Malaria is endemic here, and they don't think anything at all of some fever. We are changing that.

I find Dr. Dooley's description of his Navy experience in Indochina especially moving. He states:

We saw simple, tender, loving care, and the crudest kind of medicine, inexpertly practiced by mere boys, change a people's fear and hatred into friendship. We saw it transform the brotherhood of man from an ideal into a reality. To me, that experience was like the white light of revelation. It made me proud to be a doctor—an American doctor who had been privileged to witness the enormous possibilities of medical aid in all its Christlike power and simplicity.

Instead of being discouraged by the enormity of the task before him, Dr. Dooley was fired up with hope and with practical energy. He founded a non-profit, nonsectarian organization, Medico, to gather money, equipment, and personnel to enable him to do the work he saw must be done. He opened hospitals first in Laos and later six others in Asia, Africa, and South America.

Dr. Dooley's love for humanity, and his great vision of human needs is combined with a down to earth sense of what is possible. He says:

I believe that those of us who attempt to aid in a foreign land must be content with small achievements.

He makes use of local residents as practical nurses, midwives, and orderlies whenever he can. He keeps the cost of the medical care he practices to a bare minimum—last year he treated more than 36,000 persons at a little less than \$1 a year for each patient. But in a sense his very great realism in viewing his tremendous goals make his successes all the greater.

Dr. Howard Rusk writing on two different occasions in the New York Times has pointed up the tremendous potential of Dr. Dooley's contribution for the entire world. On August 23 he wrote of Dooley's work:

His own fight against cancer he considers just a skirmish, when the tools of health and healing can combat the international cancer of communism.

One week later, Dr. Rusk stated:

Tom Dooley has awakened anew our realization that healing is a priceless tool in the winning of men's minds for freedom. He has been not only a great emissary for healing, but for peace.

For Dr. Dooley, the fruits of his work are in themselves a sufficient reward. He describes his attitude with these words:

All our Medico doctors are happy men. They have the happiness that comes to people who have found the path, the path that leads out of themselves and into involvement with mankind. They will be able to look back at the end of their lives and feel they've accomplished something important.

I wish to add my congratulations and admiration to those of many others who feel as I do that this award is richly deserved by a splendid American, Dr. Thomas Dooley. He has heard and truly followed the lesson of the two great commandments—love of God and love of neighbor.

In my remarks, I include a news item appearing in a recent issue of a Washington newspaper:

DR. DOOLEY, LAOS HOSPITAL FOUNDER, TO RECEIVE HERITAGE AWARD HERE

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the founder of jungle hospitals in Laos, will come to Washington June 16 to receive the annual Lay Churchman Award of Religious Heritage of America, Inc., the organization announced yesterday.

Others who will receive awards are: Ruth Youngdahl Nelson, churchwoman of the year; D. Elton Trueblood, clergy churchman of the year; and George W. Cornell, faith and freedom award in religious journalism.

The awards will be presented at a dinner in the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Paul Wooton, Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, will be toastmaster.

Dr. Dooley, a graduate of the University of Notre Dame and the St. Louis School of Medicine, gained fame when his book "Deliver Us From Evil," describing his fight against disease in Halphong, North Vietnam, became a best seller. He founded his first hospital in Laos with proceeds from the book and help from U.S. drug firms.

He returned to the United States last summer for a cancer operation and again this spring for a checkup. He is going back to Laos at the end of the month.

Mrs. Nelson is a writer of inspirational religious books. She was District of Columbia Mother of the Year in 1953, and Scandinavian Woman of the Year in 1954. She is a member of the National Board of Christian Higher Education of the Augustana Lutheran Church. Her husband, the Reverend Dr. Clarence T. Nelson, is president of the Council of Churches, National Capital area. She is a sister of Federal Judge Luther W. Youngdahl.

Dr. Trueblood interrupted a career as religious author and professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Ind., in 1954, to serve 2 years as chief of religious information for the U.S. Information Agency. He is a former executive secretary of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of Friends. His latest book, a religious best seller, is "Confronting Christ."

Cornell, a religious writer for the Associated Press since 1951, writes a weekly column called "Religion Today." His book, "They Knew Jesus," was published 2 years ago.

Announcement of the awards was made by Lisle M. Ramsey, president of Religious Heritage.

The awards dinner is a highlight of the Heritage's annual 3-day Washington pilgrimage. Previous award winners include President Eisenhower, Evangelist Billy Graham, and the late Cecil B. de Mille.

#### THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE COMMITTEE'S HISTORIC REPORT ON TRUJILLO; IS CASTRO NEXT?

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the Inter-American Peace Committee transmitted its report of its investigation into "the flagrant violations of human rights by the Government of the Dominican Republic," to use the words of the charge made by Ambassador Marcos Falcon-Briceno for the Government of Venezuela.

While very important, the condemnation of Trujillo's barbaric tyranny by this distinguished Committee acting for the Organization of American States is secondary to the precedent established. If we are to have peace with freedom in the world, we will attain it only through this kind of collective intervention on behalf of the principles of freedom and democracy.

This historic report stands as a proud achievement for the OAS as it seeks to fulfill its purpose, the promotion of representative democracy and human rights in a peaceful, thriving hemisphere.

The United Nations can profit by this example. A world shocked by the abortive summit conference can properly take comfort from this action by the Inter-American Peace Committee.

This report, of course, is not the end in any sense. It is the basis and the beginning of further action with respect to Trujillo's foul government and others resembling it in the hemisphere. This collective intervention is only by words—strong, authoritative words, the power of which should not be underestimated. Steps should be taken now to publicize this report throughout Latin America and particularly in the Dominican Republic.

#### PUBLICIZE THE CHARGES

Let radio stations in Puerto Rico, Florida, Honduras, Cuba, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and elsewhere be the Joshua's trumpets to blast down the crumbling walls of Trujillo's doomed government. This clarion call comes, not from one individual or from one or two nations, but from virtually the entire hemisphere.

Trujillo refused to allow the Peace Committee to enter the Dominican Republic. He was, understandably, afraid. The committee heard testimony from many exiles and from others. It was my privilege to have a small part in helping some of these witnesses come before the committee.

The conclusion was no surprise:

That international tensions in the Caribbean region have been aggravated by flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic.

What were some of these violations by Trujillo and his gang? They include denial of free assembly and of free speech, arbitrary arrests, cruel and inhuman treatment of political prisoners, and the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons.

These acts—

Said the report—constitute the denial of fundamental rights set forth in the American Declaration of the

Rights and Duties of Man, as well as of principles of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

#### TRUJILLO'S CRIMES ABROAD

The Committee found that these systematic violations by the Trujillo government increased the tensions existing in the Caribbean region. Reference was made to the illegal activities of agents of the Dominican Government abroad. I can cite, among others, the case of Jesus de Galindez, in which my own constituent, Gerald Lester Murphy, was unwittingly and fatally involved.

Trujillo gave the United States an insultingly false explanation of Murphy's death, an explanation which we formally rejected. No other was ever submitted.

The entire text of this epoch-making "Report of the Inter-American Peace Committee on the Case Presented by the Government of Venezuela" is set forth at the conclusion of these remarks. It is a document worth the close attention of every Member of Congress.

The Inter-American Peace Committee members, all outstanding men, were Ambassador John C. Dreier, representative of the United States, Chairman of the Committee; Ambassador Hector David Castro, representative of El Salvador; Ambassador Vicente Sanchez Gavito, representative of Mexico; Ambassador Carlos A. Clulow, representative of Uruguay; Minister Santiago Salazar Santos, representative of Colombia.

Hemispheric opinion, when expressed by these men in their roles as official investigators for the Organization of American States, can and should be very powerful. Wide and repeated publicity may be sufficient to finish the Trujillo government.

If more action is necessary to gain respect for human rights, the means are at hand. Once, not long ago, such a report could not have been made. Even to propose such a committee would have been to call down emphatic objections of intervention, followed by the express or implied statement that the United States was again interfering in the affairs of its sister states.

The United States has changed its ways in this respect. The OAS is not a facade for U.S. imperialism. It is a sovereign body of which the United States is one member. We can and we do lead on occasion but we have learned not to push or to try to dominate.

#### TRUJILLO SOON TO FALL

Other measures against the Trujillo Government can take the form of diplomatic and commercial sanctions, but these need not be considered at this time because it appears that they will not be necessary. Trujillo has his bags packed.

There are other nations in the hemisphere where systematic violations of human rights are being perpetrated and thus increasing tensions. Nicaragua and Paraguay both have governments which should be investigated by the Inter-American Peace Committee, but first its attention should be turned toward Castro's Government of Cuba. It is different but, in terms of tensions affecting the peace of the hemisphere, no less important.

Castro's promises of elections in 18 months have been laid aside in favor of mob approval. His one-time respect for a free press has vanished along with all the free newspapers. Anyone who disagrees out loud goes to jail.

Castro promised to carry out land reform under his law providing for inventories and payment, but many takings are confiscations from law-abiding citizens, or foreigners who have good records of productivity in the use of their lands and who did not support Batista.

Castro often said that he would protect the 26th of July revolution from being taken over by any other faction, including the Communists. Serious questions for investigation are whether Castro is allowing the transshipping of Communist arms to Communist-directed revolutionaries elsewhere in Latin America, and whether he is allowing Cuban anti-Americanism, in part understandable, to be exaggerated and used by the international Communists.

#### CASTRO IS NOT TRUJILLO

Would Castro allow an OAS Peace Committee to carry on an investigation in Cuba? I have heard that he would not. I hope I have heard wrong. Cuba today is not the Dominican Republic, and Castro with all his shortcomings as a chief executive, is no Trujillo.

Not long after I returned from a visit to Cuba in January 1959, shortly after Batista's overthrow, I said on the floor of the House that many Cubans who hated Batista were "sickened by the thought that Fidel Castro, perhaps in spite of himself, may end up just another Latin American strong man ruling for an interval by terror and tribute. This is by no means impossible."

Castro does not, as yet anyway, rule by terror in the way Batista ruled and Trujillo rules. He does use a lot of intimidation and this can all too easily and quickly edge into terror. Nearly everyone concedes that Castro is personally honest and that his government is incredibly uncorrupt. He is not "just another Latin American strong man."

Cuba was overdue for a social and economic revolution. The question is whether Castro's headlong and headstrong leadership can lead to anything but disaster. For the asking he could have had the strong and invaluable help of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, former President Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, and Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. They hated Batista and they favored a social revolution in Cuba, but they like most Americans believe in free elections and individual rights.

Castro could have had friendly, generous help from a United States whose policies about dictators were, at the very moment when Castro came to power, changing drastically. Cuba would have profited by our improved policies and by our embarrassment for past shameful support of Batista. But public opinion in the hemisphere has turned against Castro. Unless he changes his attitude about free elections and individual rights, Cuban public opinion also will turn against him.

We have to face the situation as it is. An accurate, authoritative assessment can be made by the OAS Inter-American Peace Committee, preferably by an investigation within the boundaries of Cuba but, if necessary, right here in Washington by interviewing exiles and others with firsthand information about the state of human rights in Cuba today.

#### THE ROLL OF THE OAS

The historic precedent has been set by the report issued a week ago. The OAS must now continue to fulfill its great obligations to the peoples of this hemisphere in accordance with the principles set forth in its charter.

The hemisphere needs a definitive report about the tensions apparently emanating from Castro's government of Cuba. I wish I could be as calm and undisturbed about Cuba's immediate future as some seemingly well-qualified observers appear to be. Too many democratic friends of mine have been forced out of the Government or have withdrawn their support. Castro's repeated irrational rantings against the United States and his tolerance of Communists makes me shudder, not for our dignity but for what must soon be the sorry consequences in Cuba. There is much trouble ahead for the people of Cuba under a government led by a man who misrepresents and distorts facts, ignores his own laws, and fails to recognize that communism is a tyranny.

I have asked him many times, personally, by mail and by cablegram, about setting a date for elections, about permitting freedom of the press, about opposing Communist tyranny as he opposed Batista tyranny, about enforcing the terms of his own agrarian reform law, and about many other measures which I along with others felt in the best interests of the Cuban people. My suggestions and criticisms have largely been ignored.

No doubt there is much I do not know, perhaps much I cannot understand, about Cuba's deep, broad, and intense revolution. That is why I hope that the OAS Inter-American Peace Committee will go forward to carry on its historic mission and to proceed to investigate the status of human rights in Cuba.

The following, in addition to the complete text of the report by the Inter-American Peace Committee, are one editorial and several articles about Cuba. To some extent they only add to my mystification about Castro's government and the Cuban revolution, but the authors appear to be qualified, sincere witnesses whose testimony should be heard and evaluated along with testimony of those who hold different opinions.

#### REPORT OF THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE COMMITTEE ON THE CASE PRESENTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA

The Government of Venezuela, in a note of February 17, 1960, signed by its representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, requested the Inter-American Peace Committee to investigate "the flagrant violations of human rights by the Government of the Dominican Republic, which are aggravating tensions in the Caribbean."

The Committee decided, first, that in view of the powers and functions which were



given it in resolution IV of the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, it was within its competence to consider the request of the Government of Venezuela. As will be recalled, that resolution, in entrusting to the Committee the study of the questions that were the subject of the convocation of the meeting of consultation, provides in article 1, paragraph (b), that the Inter-American Peace Committee shall examine—

"The relationship between violations of human rights or the nonexercise of representative democracy, on the one hand, and the political tensions that affect the peace of the hemisphere, on the other."

In this determination regarding its competence the representative of Venezuela, who had withdrawn from active participation as a committee member at the time when he presented his Government's request, did not take part. Colombia was designated as a substitute by the Council of the Organization, on March 1, 1960, in accordance with article 11 of the statutes of the Committee.

In order to gather as much reliable information as possible with respect to this case, the Committee requested information from the member states in a circular note of February 25, 1960, sent to all the representatives on the Council except those of the Dominican Republic and Venezuela, with whom the Committee has remained in contact.

The Committee considered that it would be desirable to visit the Dominican Republic in order to investigate on the scene the situation existing in that country. For that purpose the Committee decided to exchange points of view with the representative of the Dominican Republic on the Council. The corresponding invitation was extended by means of a note dated February 19, 1960, with which the Dominican representative received a copy of the note from the representative of Venezuela. The resultant conversations were initiated on February 24, 1960.

In the course of these conversations with the Dominican representative, the Committee requested and obtained from him information regarding the case under study and, in accordance with the provisions of article 2 of resolution IV of the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, asked him if his Government would be prepared to give its consent for the Committee to visit the Dominican Republic in order to carry out the investigations that it considered necessary.

During the session held on March 8, 1960, the representative of the Dominican Republic stated that his Government, in the exercise of its option provided for in article 2 of the above-mentioned resolution IV, did not give its consent for the Committee to visit the Dominican Republic. The reasons given by the representative of the Dominican Republic, on informing the Committee of the decision of his Government, were reiterated in a note which he sent to the chairman of the Committee on March 24, 1960.

In view of the interest which existed regarding its actions in this case, the Committee decided to issue a press release on March 18, 1960, making public the negative reply of the Dominican Government.

In its conversations held with the representative of the Dominican Republic, the Committee expressed its natural and particular interest in obtaining information regarding the arrests in his country of persons involved in the subversive movement put down by the Dominican authorities in January 1960. The Committee had received reports on this matter to the effect that there had been more than a thousand such arrests. In this regard, the representative of the Dominican Republic said that, in accordance with official reports of his Government, the number of persons who had recently been

arrested in his country for activities directed against the security of the state amounted to 222; he referred to the acts of clemency of the Dominican Government in favor of these persons, such as the release of the women who had participated in the movement and the reduction of some of the sentences imposed by the lower courts; he gave the Committee a memorandum containing a chronological account of the cases of amnesty and pardon of persons condemned in the course of the last 25 years for acts against the security of the Dominican State; and he suggested the desirability of the Committee's studying the question of violations of human rights in the Caribbean region in its general aspects and not in relation to only one of the countries comprising that region.

In view of these statements of the Dominican representative and taking into account various reports and documents which by then had been received by the Committee—for example, the second pastoral letter of the Dominican bishops, dated February 28, 1960—the Committee believed that there was reason to hope that the Dominican Government would decree an amnesty for the political prisoners or would adopt some other measure of clemency in their favor, on the occasion of Easter, April 17, 1960. Desirous of avoiding any step which might adversely affect the fate of the political prisoners, the Committee deemed it desirable not to make any pronouncements on the case under study during the first days of April and decided in favor of issuing a report of a general nature, dated April 14, entitled "Special Report on the Relationship Between Violations of Human Rights or the Non-Exercise of Representative Democracy and the Political Tensions that Affect the Peace of the Hemisphere," in which, among other matters, questions related to the existence of political prisoners in the American Republics are considered.

The Committee's hopes regarding an amnesty turned out to be unfounded. In fact, it was not until May 31 that the Committee received a note from the Dominican representative, dated May 30, in which the Committee was informed that "within the Dominican Government's process of carrying out acts of clemency in behalf of persons involved in the subversive plots discovered at the beginning of the year, another group of 63 of the persons sentenced was set free on Saturday, May 28, 1960."

Despite the Dominican Government's having declined to give its consent for the Committee to visit its territory, the Committee decided to obtain, through means available to it, reliable information regarding the subject of the request presented by the Venezuelan representative.

The Committee received testimony from Dominican exiles who had recently left that country, as well as from nationals of other American countries who had been in the Dominican Republic during, or just after, the events which gave rise to the arrests that occurred beginning in the month of January 1960. Among the Dominican exiles interviewed by the Committee were representatives of different social and economic spheres of the country, such as educators, workers, former members of the armed forces, industrialists and businessmen. These interviews were held in closed sessions and the Committee does not consider it desirable to make public the names of the witnesses or the text of their statements.

In addition to the testimony of actual witnesses of the situation existing in the Dominican Republic, the Committee examined extensive and reliable press material and also made use of valuable information provided it by certain representatives of member states.

On the basis of the evidence which it has been able to gather, the Committee has reached the conclusion that international tensions in the Caribbean region have been

aggravated by flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic. Among these violations, mention must be made of the denial of free assembly and of free speech, arbitrary arrests, cruel and inhuman treatment of political prisoners, and the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons. Some of the victims of these grave acts appeared before the Committee and made statements. These acts constitute the denial of fundamental rights set forth in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, as well as of principles of the charter of the Organization of American States.

The relationship between the systematic violation of human rights and international political tensions that affect the peace of the hemisphere was analyzed by the Committee in its above-mentioned special report of April 14, 1960—Document CIP-2-60. The case which is the subject of the present report confirms, in the judgment of the Committee, the conclusions which it reached as a result of the above-mentioned analysis since it is evident that the violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic, just alluded to, have increased the tensions existing in the Caribbean region.

In the above-mentioned special report some observations were also made regarding the problems confronting the governments which give territorial asylum to the citizens of the countries governed by dictatorial regimes that do not respect the fundamental rights of the human individual. Those observations are particularly applicable to the situation created by the presence, at the current time, of many Dominican exiles in the countries of the Caribbean region, by the circumstance that in recent months there has been an increase in the number of Dominican nationals seeking refuge in foreign countries, and by the appreciable intensification of the activities of the exiles directed toward effecting a change in the government of their native country. Likewise, it should be mentioned that these groups of Dominicans, as well as numerous persons and organizations of different nationalities, are requesting, through the press and in public demonstrations, the adoption of international measures against the present Government of the Dominican Republic. This situation is the cause of serious concern, and has created difficult problems, for the governments of the countries receiving the refugees, where public opinion has for some time been aroused over the state of affairs in the Dominican Republic.

Regarding the foregoing, the committee must also refer to the repercussions resulting from the circumstance that public opinion has linked certain violent acts which have occurred in different American countries with illegal activities of agents of the Dominican Government abroad. The Committee has received and continues to receive reports concerning these cases, but, independently of any conclusions which it may reach on the matter, it considers it to be its duty to point out that existing tensions in the Caribbean have been heightened in an exceptional manner by this public reaction.

The Dominican Government has reacted very adversely to these developments. Among the manifestations of the foregoing are the attacks in the press, by radio and other means of propaganda of the Dominican Republic against those governments and chiefs of state who have shown sympathy for the cause of the Dominican exiles. As this subject exceeds the limited scope of the present report, the Committee will not analyze it at present. It must, however, express its opinion that this course of action, in turn, constitutes an additional element of disturbance in international relations in the hemisphere.

In view of all that which has been stated above, the Committee stresses the fact that international tensions in the Caribbean area, far from diminishing, have been increased and that, in its view, these tensions will continue to increase so long as the flagrant violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic persist.

JOHN C. DREIER,  
Ambassador, Representative of the  
United States; Chairman of the  
Committee.

HECTOR DAVID CASTRO,  
Ambassador, Representative of El  
Salvador.

VICENTE SANCHEZ GAVITO,  
Ambassador, Representative of Mexico.

CARLOS A. CLULOW,  
Ambassador, Representative of Uruguay.

SANTIAGO SALAZAR SANTOS,  
Minister, Representative of Colombia.

JUNE 6, 1960.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 9, 1960]

#### CUBA: RESTRAINT BUT NOT INACTION

Cuba's Premier Castro is in much the same position as a little boy who knows that grownups aren't supposed to strike children who play pranks.

His recent announcement that Soviet Premier Khrushchev will visit Cuba—plus broad hints that Chinese Premier Chou En-lai may follow—constitutes a sort of diplomatic hotfoot for Uncle Sam.

The question is how serious a hotfoot is it? And how do Latin American onlookers interpret it?

Many persons in the United States have jumped to the conclusion that the danger from a major Cuban-Soviet or Cuban-Chinese tie lies mainly in the field of mysterious submarine or missile bases.

Such speculation tends to divert attention from more likely dangers: (1) that Dr. Castro can be persuaded by his Marxist allies to act as a transshipper of arms to Communist-directed revolutionaries elsewhere in Latin America; and (2) that his newly established network of Cuban propaganda offices and radio stations may sow anti-Americanism there.

It is easy to see that these two areas might tempt the Cuban revolutionary hero. Since his rise to power he has gradually moved away from strictly internal reform and begun dabbling in big-power politics—first as a declared neutralist, currently as a man determined to give Moscow the benefit of the doubt and Washington doubt for every benefit.

In the process, he has shown an increasing faith in the exportability of his revolution, which has meanwhile moved away from moderate socialist reforms toward arbitrary extremism.

This is a harsh assessment of a revolution that started out to be a new deal for Cuba, and has, in fact, made much desirable progress against illiteracy and an underdiversified economy. But it is an assessment that is becoming more widely recognized among leaders in the hemisphere. And the Khrushchev visit tends to confirm it.

But if this hotfoot is a symptom of something serious—and it is recognized as such by many Latin democratic leaders—what can be done?

Certainly economic or military retaliation against Havana is not the answer. Dr. Castro still maintains wide support at home. His reform successes, loudly trumpeted, are still magnetically popular with many constituents of the very democratic leftist reformers in Latin America who have themselves become disenchanted with Castro. U.S. intervention would martyrize Dr. Castro and reverse the eye-opening now going on.

But there are several other fields for positive action:

1. The United States can present more undistorted information about its support for reform and human rights, both by radio and in print in local languages of the landless and downtrodden. (It should not continue to let Moscow broadcast in Latin-American Indian dialects without competition.)

2. Working through the Organization of American States, Washington can support a tightened arms limitation agreement (limitation, not prohibition). It can help organize joint patrolling against sea- or air-borne arms smuggling.

3. Congress can give the President discretionary power to adjust sugar quotas should the hotfoot get too hot.

4. Washington can do much more through coordinated economic aid to help new democratic reform governments gain support from the underprivileged and discontented.

[From Social Order magazine, March 1960]

#### CASTRO AND CUBA—THE POLITICS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By William P. Glade, Jr.)

Only a year ago cheers and applause greeted Castro's appearance in our movie newsreels. They have now, reports Miss Dorothy Kilgallen, changed to boos and hisses, the popular expression of a disenchantment daily more widespread.

Journalists who praised the barbudo's early successes have become vocal in opposition.<sup>1</sup> Congressional affirmations of sympathetic interest gradually diminished to a whisper, to be submerged altogether in recent weeks by mounting criticism and none-too-subtle references to sugar import quotas. After months of what appeared to be a studiously patient and conciliatory policy, toward the end of this past October, the State Department's attitude stiffened markedly and the first of a number of official protests was made.

The events underlying this growing apprehensiveness are, in their externals at least, too well known to require more than the briefest recapitulation.

After the first shock of the trials and executions, Castro's reckless call for an \$80 billion Western Hemisphere "Marshall plan" seemed to epitomize the general disorganization of Cuban government. Promises of free elections grew increasingly vague and the suppression of dissent took on a harsher tone. A further ominous note was added by reports of a new secret police and neighborhood spy network. Censorship and bullying of the Cuban press together with mistreatment of U.S. correspondents virtually assured a bad press abroad.

Charges of Red influence came to seem plausible as the Cuban labor movement, crying American imperialism, pulled out of the ICFU, as new laws expanded the scope of government intervention in the economy, and as expropriation of agricultural and mineral properties began. All the while, anti-U.S. feeling was being whipped up at mass rallies by a strident demagoguery reminiscent of Peron in his heyday.

In short, the bewhiskered youthful heroes of December 1958 came by December 1959 to seem to many rather more like aging juve-

<sup>1</sup> Jules Dubois, a veteran correspondent who was one of Castro's staunchest supporters and who authored a highly complimentary biography of the Cuban leader, "Freedom Is My Beat" (Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1959), published a series of articles in late November 1959 (Chicago Tribune Press Service) entitled "Cuba's Tragedy"—a bitter denunciation of allegedly "totalitarian" and "communistic" aspects of the revolution.

nile delinquents, attired in jungle costumes and beatnik beards and with a strong bent for histrionics and violence.

The simplest interpretation of these events is that put forward by newsmen such as Dubois and Novins and by defecting revolutionaries aided by the publicity of congressional hearings: the Cuban revolution is being taken over by Communists and fellow travelers.

It would be foolish to deny the presence of Communists in Cuba.<sup>2</sup> They have been there for years and the deteriorating political and social conditions of the past decade were ready made for their agitation. Doubtless, too, many of the Communists are now wearing beards. Yet to call the Cuban developments communistic is, because of the emotion-arousing quality of that term, dangerously misleading as a guide to policy, for there is nothing in the changes effected so far which is distinctively or even primarily Marxist.

The potential menace of Communist infiltration which has been outlined in recent CIA reports is one thing; "leftist" policies which are not in and of themselves Marxist are quite another. To construe them as evidence of Red influence is to obfuscate important aspects of contemporary Cuban developments and to play into Communist hands by identifying communism with all important social change.

In part, this Marxist-in-the-sugarcane-field view probably stems from a failure to appreciate the singular differences between the Anglo-American approach and the Byzantine-Hispanic approach to economic matters. The wide latitude for intervention in economic affairs, for example, seems no more than a contemporary expression of the historic Iberian propensity to rely heavily upon state action to promote the public good. While state-operated enterprises have been set up to sell goods (largely foodstuffs) at prices designed to force drastic reductions in high retail markups, this sale of goods from public stores is an anti-inflation technique with repeated precedents throughout the long era of Spanish colonial rule. As such, it reflects not so much an ideological antipathy to private enterprise as a healthy and well-founded skepticism about the degree of competition prevailing in the market.

Similarly, the laws on expropriation and agrarian reform reflect essentially the contingent (rather than absolute) nature of property rights in the Hispanic legal tradition, a functional concept of property which stems from Byzantine law and medieval Catholic teaching.<sup>3</sup> Certain key sections of the agrarian reform law are, in fact, hardly more than restatements of land reform instructions issued two centuries ago by the

<sup>2</sup> "Reds Stealing Cuba's Revolution, Editor Reports," is a headline in the Jan. 15, 1960, Catholic diocesan press. The story is written by Jaime Fonseca, editor of Noticias Catolicas, Spanish and Portuguese language service of NCWC News Service. Based on three visits to Cuba since Castro came to power, Mr. Fonseca reports that "there is a formal understanding between the Castro regime's leaders and the agents of international communism, according to keymen close to the Castro brothers during the underground days."—Ed.

<sup>3</sup> Readers unfamiliar with 19th and 20th century developments in Latin America should bear in mind, too, that, in the first place, the validity of most land titles to the larger estates is extremely questionable and that, in the second place, over against the present day expropriation of the landowner's property must be set the generations of landowner expropriation of the suprasubsistence production of rural labor.



Spanish crown to the intendants (high officials of the imperial bureaucracy). They are about as communistic as those notorious old Marxists, the Bourbon kings.

Even anti-U.S. sentiment can be discounted as evidence of Marxism, for it too has roots deep in the neo-Iberian culture of Latin America, reinforced in Cuba's case by the natural resentment a small and poorer country feels for its rich and dominating neighbor.<sup>4</sup>

Since at least the Moorish occupation and possibly during the anterior Visigothic invasions, a certain cultural arrogance and xenophobia have been characteristic of the Hispanic world. In modern times Latin Americans of a wide diversity of views on other subjects have united in seeing the Western Hemisphere in terms of civilized, Catholic Latin society of the south versus the barbarian, Protestant commercialism of the "Colossus of the North."<sup>5</sup> Nowhere has this view been better expressed than in the Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó's unforgettable portrayal of the Latin "Ariel" confronting the materialistic U.S. "Caliban."

Here again geography functions to reinforce a cultural bias, for the green shores of the Antillean pearl are only a U.S. rocket's range away from the neon-lit hedonism of Miami, while yanqui tourism, a basic prop of Havana's economy, and the main contact of many Cubans with U.S. life, has been notable for its focus on bordellos and gaming tables. These, in turn, have constituted in large part the foreign investment activities of U.S. gangster elements. Both the sugar and spice of Cuban life have been, therefore, ever-present reminders of yanqui control.

#### THE BASIS OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Lastly, at least a part of the popular anti-Americanism in Cuba today can be explained by the simple expedient of placing our reiterated statements regarding the "traditionally cordial relations between the Governments of the United States and Cuba" against the historical record of the corrupt and dictatorial Cuban regimes with which, by self-admission, we have maintained such warm relations. The Cuban masses may well be excused for a certain skepticism about the keen interest of the United States in democracy and social justice. It is worth noting in this context that if the United States should persist in unrealistic and unreasonable demands for compensation for expropriated properties, as it has lately given evidence of doing, the situation could worsen materially. The plain fact is that there exists a real basis for Castro's charges that the United States has attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of Cuba, an accusation to be appraised later.

An alternative explanation of the events rests on historical precedent. What are involved, according to this view, are just the "normal" Jacobin excesses prior to the Thermidorean reaction, for as the historians of revolution have noted, the enthusiasm of the fighting spirit not infrequently carries over under its own momentum into the

period of triumph. The positive, constructive tasks of political direction, of course, suffer distortion by subordination to the negative logic of combat.

In such cases, nationalistic leaders, imbued with plans to rebuild society, are quite apt to pull down the old abode before working out plans for building the new. Latin America, with its tradition of youthful radicalism among university students and its caudillo tradition, in which leaders are prone to succumb to the old Hispanic weakness of seeing themselves as actors in a drama, would seem to be especially susceptible to this sort of revolutionary excess.

So chaotic may be the consequences of this situation that one writer has aptly made reference to a "Samson complex" whereby nationalist leaders flex their muscles, lean against the economic pillars, and bring the house down on those whom they regard as the source of their troubles—and on their own heads at the same time.<sup>6</sup>

A closely related interpretation is the scapegoat theory which has been expounded, among other places, in the pages of the *Wall Street Journal*.<sup>7</sup> According to this view, antiforeign sentiment has been whipped up to conceal either a poverty of constructive ideas or of failures of domestic policy.<sup>8</sup>

The difficulty with the first variation, however, is that even if the Cuban leaders had no ideas of their own, by now the world is surfeited with proposals for reform and change. There exists, as it were, a vast inventory of social engineering projects, a common pool or stockpile upon which the would-be reformer is free to draw. In any case, moreover, the current objection to the Cuban revolution would seem pretty clearly to be not that it is directionless but that its direction is unacceptable (to the United States and to upperclass Cubans).<sup>9</sup>

As for the second variation—that anti-U.S. feeling is, along with repressive rule, a device for covering up failure—evidence of any really substantial failure is simply lacking.

It is perfectly true that various Havana business indicators are down—reflecting mainly a massive turnover in the civil service, high unemployment in the construction industry, and the slump in the tourist industry and auxiliary services—and that examples of economic gaucheries are not lacking in the agricultural field. But none of this is sufficient to indict the present Cuban Government as a failure. All are attributable to rather special circumstances.

#### REGIME IS HONEST

Because the old civil service was composed almost entirely of notoriously corrupt political appointees of the Batista regime, it was imperative to "clean house" and provide public functionaries loyal to the objectives of

the new government. In recording the achievements of the Castro government, it is indicative of its high moral tone that even its bitterest critics have not accused it of the most glaring defect of previous regimes: a scandalously pervasive dishonesty in all branches of government. Efficient bureaucratic teamwork, however, is largely a matter of accumulated experience and ought not, therefore, to be expected while the new government is still in its infancy.

Construction, in prerevolutionary Cuba as elsewhere in Latin America, consisted primarily of urban work of an essentially non-productive nature—the erection of palatial homes, luxury apartment houses, and overly elaborate office buildings—the cessation of which reflects no consequential loss in productive output to the national economy. Already some of the urban construction labor force (along with underemployed rural labor) have been directed into activities of a socially more constructive character. There is no real economic reason why the rest of the unemployed should not be similarly reabsorbed over the month ahead.<sup>10</sup>

Taking a long view, one is probably safe in assuming that the decline in tourism is only a temporary phenomenon. As domestic conditions become more stable and as the U.S. press turns its search for sensationalism to other areas of the globe, the food of dollar-toting travelers will in all likelihood resume, for the substantial natural advantages of the island have, of course, remained intact and the Government has slashed prices to add to their attractiveness. Insofar as a certain sedateness repels the tourist, the revival of this key sector of the economy may be somewhat delayed; but who would wish to quarrel with the Cubans on this score? Some of the auxiliary tourist services of the past, such as prostitution and wide-open gambling, rested on such a dubious moral basis that a return to the status quo ante is unthinkable.

Finally, it must be noted that neither is there to be detected evidence of any significant failure in agriculture. Some dislocations and maladjustments are inevitable during a period of sweeping change, but various reports would seem to indicate that while land redistribution is taking place quite quickly and, in some cases rather informally, all things considered, the transition seems on the whole remarkably smooth. Wages in agriculture have risen somewhat above their previously meager level (an essential step in creating a stronger internal market and providing more effective incentives for the rural labor force) and some of the new agricultural cooperatives appear to be receiving expert technical assistance.

In all of this the role of government has bulked large. Substantial governmental tutelage is likely to be a basic ingredient of agricultural reform for some time to come, and this for reasons which have little to do with ideology. Generations of peonage have

<sup>10</sup> Some observers have charged, rather unconvincingly, that the Government's public works outlays are unproductive. It is difficult to see why the construction of rural roads and bridges does not represent important investments in social overhead capital and why even the provision of better worker housing should not be considered as directly conducive to higher levels of economic welfare and, very probably, indirectly productive because of the effect on worker morale. Such criticism stems in part from the old confusion between money costs and real costs and in part from a failure to contrast this type of expenditure with the prerevolutionary alternatives noted above. Is public expenditure on worker housing necessarily a less productive use of resources than private expenditure on fancy apartments?

<sup>4</sup> Cuba gained its independence from Spain only to fall promptly under the influence of the United States. U.S. investments in sugar, minerals, tobacco, and public utilities came rapidly to control the Cuban economy and on several occasions provided the excuse for American military occupation of the island—all this, it must be remembered, in the 20th century. Today some 75 percent of Cuba's imports comes from its powerful neighbor and around 65 percent of its exports goes to the U.S. market.

<sup>5</sup> According to Tad Szulc, *New York Times*, Nov. 5, 1959, most of the current anti-U.S. feeling throughout Latin America is found among non-Communist groups.

<sup>6</sup> Indonesia might well provide the neatest "fit" to this concept. After first pulling down the Dutch pillar and finding that the house neither collapsed nor became noticeably roomier, the nationalist Samson has turned his attention recently to pulling down another major prop—the Chinese business community.

<sup>7</sup> See p. 1 of the issue of Oct. 27, 1959. The fairly extensive Cuban coverage in *Time* and *U.S. News & World Report* also plays heavily on this theme.

<sup>8</sup> Similar, for example, to the scapegoat use of Israel by the backward regimes of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

<sup>9</sup> As Harold Lavine has pointed out in a noteworthy article in *Commentary* ("Social Revolution in Cuba," October 1959, pp. 324-328), the upperclass supporters of the Castro movement in its early days were aiming for the establishment of a conventional liberal democracy rather than the basic social revolution which has emerged increasingly as the paramount objective of the new regime.

scarcely prepared the impoverished and uneducated Cuban rustic<sup>11</sup> to assume forthwith the role of an independent rural entrepreneur; stern economic necessity therefore dictates the use of state controls to gear the output of new agricultural entities to overall objectives as well as to prevent the peasantry from consuming too much of its output. That mistakes will be made in this governmental guidance is a certainty, a fact which demonstrates merely the unavoidably experimental nature of initial planning efforts rather than the futility of such intervention.<sup>12</sup>

It should be observed in passing that a future decline in sugar output cannot be taken *ipso facto* as evidence of failure, though it is certain that a sizeable portion of the U.S. press will so interpret it in order to discredit the land reform program. Because of world market conditions, sugar sales were already sluggish in 1957 and 1958 while domestic stockpiles were growing. It is entirely conceivable, then, that sound economics might call for reductions in sugar output and increases in other crops, particularly since the premium price paid for Cuban sugar may no longer be forthcoming when the U.S. sugar interests are replaced by Cuban ownership.

#### ECONOMY FOUNDERING DOUBTED

In short, it is hard to find conclusive evidence that the revolutionary government is foundering on economic difficulties of its own making, though it is necessarily tackling sizeable economic problems inherited from the previous era and is up against some extraordinary difficult tasks in effecting the changes it has as its goals. Fundamental reorganization of a national economy is obviously not an overnight transformation.

All this is not to deny the possibility that the revolutionary program may eventually fall amidst general economic chaos, in which case either a Communist takeover or a reactionary coup would be a strong probability. It is, however, far too premature to pass such a judgment at present. To do so is to misread the record—or to betray either undue pessimism or wishful thinking.

It is the main contention of this article that the growing anti-United States feeling and the intensity of opinion formation by the Cuban Government reflect the successes of the revolution rather than its failures and are, moreover, well-nigh indispensable instruments in that success.

The present government stands publicly dedicated to two main projects: 1. effecting basic social reforms and 2. undertaking a reorientation of the economy by a development program of industrialization and diversification. Neither task is easy under the most favorable circumstances; both are of a sort to generate, even as they are successful or perhaps to the extent that they are successful, substantial stresses and strains within the socioeconomic structure. A somewhat leftist and highly regimented state is, in all probability, the most effective

instrumentality for this simultaneous restructuring of both the economy and Cuban society.

Seen in this light, anti-Americanism and calls for continued revolutionary discipline may well be interpreted as means of masking, not failures in dealing with problems, but rather the necessarily painful nature of the solution of those problems. They are techniques, that is, for creating a popular rationale for the inevitable austerity period and the requirements of heightened effort and sacrifice during the difficult transition phase in agricultural reform and industrialization.

What has been largely obscured by the headline-winning flamboyance of the *barbudos* is the fact that side-by-side with the events noted at the outset of this article the Government has been making a serious and fairly consistent effort to move toward its chosen goals.<sup>13</sup>

In its monetary stabilization program, for example, the Government has succeeded, by means of strict controls over its dollar exchange reserves and other policies, in reversing the serious drain on gold and dollar reserves which developed during the Batista days—and this despite a sizeable capital flight as the moneyed classes voted, in effect, no confidence in the program of social reform.

#### RADICAL REFORM

In a related move, to carry through its economic programs in the face of a severe dollar shortage, the Government has imposed strict controls and high duties on various items to discourage the squandering of foreign exchange reserves on imports of consumer superfluities and to save funds for necessary investment in imports related to the development program.

Rent controls appear to have been used to halt the characteristically Latin American propensity to pour funds into luxury real estate construction and to free resources thereby for the public works program noted above.

Impending reforms in the banking system are likely to result in a more satisfactory distribution of credit to the rural sector than hitherto, formerly, as well as to the new industrial undertakings. The whole matter of savings, in fact, is apt to come up for review shortly, for with workers and peasants investing their limited capacity to save in "industrialization bonds," it will not be possible for the wealthy and middle classes to continue to drag their feet.

#### FORCED INDUSTRIALIZATION

An important move has been made in the industrialization program with the passage of the new mining law which, by levying a 5-percent tax on minerals extracted for sale in Cuba and a 25-percent tax on raw minerals extracted for export, seems designed to force the construction in Cuba of smelting and refining facilities. Mineral exports, it should be recalled, rank after sugar and tobacco as the third biggest dollar earner, though the nickel and cobalt exports have almost entirely been exported in raw form for processing in the United States. Where feasible, of course, the logical place for industrialization to begin is in the processing of a nation's raw materials.

Though land reform has moved swiftly (to prevent opposition to it from consolidat-

ing and retarding or halting it) and agricultural cooperatives have been established (to give the peasantry a "stake" in the new system), agrarian reform has been geared to development plans by the provision of technical advice and the establishment, for the time being, of delivery quotas at fixed prices for various crops.

#### FEVER VERSUS DISEASE

The objection has sometimes been raised that land reform *per se* merely treats the fever (agrarian discontent) without touching the disease (social and economic backwardness).<sup>14</sup> Apart from the fact that in Cuba the "disease" is also being treated, it is perhaps relevant to note that it is not unsound medical practice in many cases to bring down the fever as soon as possible, even independently of the treatment of the disease itself. The analogy would seem to apply in economics, for the social costs of continuing peasant unrest—the absence of what John R. Commons called "industrial goodwill"—can result in a sizeable though hidden charge (in lackadaisical productive efforts and rural strife with its attendant damage to capital and output and lost man-hours of labor power) against the output of the economy. And it is only after the rural populace has been "won over" that further constructive changes stand much chance of success.

Obviously, the foregoing and other measures for accelerating socially beneficial economic growth entail both a considerable sacrifice on the part of the hitherto privileged groups and a greatly increased productive effort on the part of all. As Ruby H. Phillips recently observed:

"The launching of Castro's austerity program has jolted the free spending, free-wheeling Cubans, and they are already beginning to grumble. The people of this island have often known poverty but they are not conditioned to planned austerity."<sup>15</sup>

Against this background, three discernible functions emerge for the anti-United States and anticounterrevolutionary campaign.

#### PLANNED AUSTERITY

First, it serves as a sort of catalyst in effecting a revolution in cultural attitudes, a means of rousing the masses from their past apathy and limited mental horizons and emphasizing cooperative effort for new social goals.

Secondly, these campaigns are merely an application in the Cuban context of what other nations, including our own, have learned and employed before with respect to the psychology of production; namely, that there is nothing like the threat of an enemy from without (whether real or imaginary is beside the point) and his allies from within to create an esprit de corps and mobilize popular support behind a crash program to lift production to higher levels, and this either to win a war or to break through to sustained economic development.

Such a personification of the threat posed by the backwardness of inherited institutional arrangements is probably essential when dealing with an unsophisticated population little conditioned to self-discipline for abstract long-term goals. Without a concrete and continuing menace, it is likely

<sup>11</sup> It is significant that in his radio message to Cuba's first national Catholic convention, attended by more than 500,000 (including Fidel Castro), Pope John XXIII felt compelled to emphasize: "The face of the world could change if true charity were to reign. . . . It is the charity of the Christian man convinced that his wealth has a social function, and that it is his duty . . . to give what is above his own needs to those deprived of the bare necessities of life."

<sup>12</sup> Father E. K. Culhane, S.J., writing in *America* ("Big Brother" Comes to Cuba," Jan. 23, 1960, pp. 502-503), deals vigorously but exclusively with these transitory difficulties, attempting thereby to build a case against the Cuban land reform program.

<sup>13</sup> Business Week is outstanding for having discerned this behind-the-scenes progress at an early date. See "Castro: Political Fireworks but Clear Economic Goals," August 1, 1959, pp. 70-74, for a sympathetic account of the constructive aspects of the economic recovery program: Labor peace, appointment of competent experts to key positions, the work of the Banco de Fomento Agrícola y Industrial de Cuba.

<sup>14</sup> Archbishop Antonio José Plaza of La Plata, Argentina, told a national conference on agrarian reform sponsored by the Association of Professionals of Catholic Action last fall: "Lands that have been abandoned or virtually so, and lands which because of their owners' neglect have low yields, can legitimately be expropriated by the state—provided a just indemnity is given—and the ownership transferred to capable, enterprising families."—Ed.

<sup>15</sup> "Castro Gets the Bill," the Reporter, Oct. 29, 1959, pp. 23-24.



that such a population, holding the mistaken notion that the solution for its predicament is easy, might become impatient with the necessarily slow progress of the development program and overthrow the whole plan before it could begin to demonstrate its value. While it is certain that Cuba cannot in the long run sever its close economic ties with the United States, it may well be that in the attempt to reduce U.S. influence, the population can achieve a substantially higher level of productivity and economic welfare.

Moreover, as suggested earlier, the external threat is not altogether fictitious. Despite the nominal stand of the United States that Cuba has a clear right to undertake internal social and economic reforms, the official American position on the compensation issue must be viewed as inimical to the democratization of the Cuban economy.

The Cuban Government has already offered compensation for expropriated properties in 20-year Government bonds based upon valuations arrived at by mutual consent between U.S. interests and the Batista government. Unless, therefore, U.S. concerns wish to concede that they conspired with the Batista government to defraud the Cuban economy (which is very likely the case), the present quarrel must perforce focus upon the manner of payment rather than the amount of payment.

To press, as the U.S. Government has done, for immediate cash-on-the-barrelhead payment is manifestly so far out of the question in a country embarking upon a development program that it is tantamount to opposing redistribution of the land in the first place.<sup>10</sup> Such a policy of nominal neutrality but practical opposition is likely to fool no one—least of all in Cuba—and only confirms the impression abroad that the U.S. State Department is the political arm of U.S. corporations.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, it must not be forgotten that even if the threat of yanqui imperialism is partially fabricated, the threat of internal counterrevolution is undoubtedly real.

An abiding threat to Latin American movements such as Castro's has been the opposition to change on the part of the oligarchy (a Latin American expression for the entrenched elite of landowners, merchants, high military brass, and foreign capitalists). More than one Latin American social revolution has foundered as a consequence of delay in taking immediate steps to eliminate the power base of this opposition. Most often the delay proved fatal as it gave the oligarchy the opportunity to gather forces and, through the machinations of military cliques and palace revolts, to annul the revolution.

<sup>10</sup> As most readers probably know, under the best of circumstances a program of rapid economic development is apt to create severe strains on a nation's balance of payments. Earnings of foreign exchange must by and large be earmarked for financing imports of capital goods and similar items needed to accelerate growth of domestic output. To divert a sizable portion of vital foreign exchange earnings into compensation payments means simply that capital is being repatriated at just the time when the need is greatest for more capital. Cash compensation would therefore be detrimental to Cuba's economic program while additional capital aid at this time would go far toward insuring the ability of Cuba to make good on bond redemptions later on.

<sup>11</sup> The expropriation-compensation issue also explains the above-noted forbearance of the State Department in the early days of the revolution: it was patient while the reform program was still in the talking stage but protested when the revolution began to make good its promises for economic and social reform.

Psychological reconditioning and tight discipline become, therefore, indispensable instruments for consolidating the social gains of the revolution by holding in check the hostility of the privileged classes. In this transitional period, a free press and free elections, in both of which oligarchic influence would be paramount, are impractical until such time as the revolution is stabilized.

#### NO PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES

U.S. readers who, from the comfort of their affluent society, cavil at the seeming harshness of Cuban policies for keeping down the opposition might well ponder the practical alternative of liquidation of the opposition through a resumption of internecine strife. Dislocations and stresses are bound to take place as reorganization of the socio-economic structure proceeds apace. To allow defectors and reactionary dissidents to prey upon them to undermine the basic goals of the revolution would appear unreasonable. The struggle has been too long and bitter and has cost too many lives already.

[From the Nation, May 28, 1960]

#### DIALOGS IN CUBA

(By Barbara Deming)

"In all my 38 years on the New York Times, I have never seen a big story so misunderstood, misinterpreted, and badly handled as the Cuban revolution."—Herbert Matthews.

Before my recent 3-week stay in Cuba, I had never played the role of journalist, and I had certainly never tried to play the role of amateur ambassador; but after a few days there, I found that I was exerting myself in both roles. The fact that I did so tells something about Cuba at this present moment. Nothing is more possible than to engage a Cuban these days in earnest conversation about the new regime, and about the misunderstandings between his country and ours. You have only to ask one question of a stranger sitting next to you in a bus, and before a minute is out, the bus will be a hubbub of discussion—every passenger eager to add his word. The only obstacle to communication that I encountered (aside from the fact that I speak a minimum of Spanish, and not all Cubans speak English) was that they are so eager to talk to Americans about what is happening, that I sometimes found myself trying to listen to two or three people at once. No one was indifferent. What is happening there is not something to which they passively submit, but something in which the great majority of Cubans feel actively engaged.

There is no blind following of Castro. Those who are most enthusiastic freely describe him as "loco" about some particular project, or term him "Superman" for wanting to think about everything himself. "We make jokes about everything, in Cuba," a young volunteer government worker told me. "Our joke about Castro is, we call him our kid. 'That kid, he's working too hard,' we say. It's very, very strange; we feel responsible for him." That attitude is also strangely contagious—so much so that, at the end of a week, having by then strong feelings about Cuba's relations with the United States, I found myself stepping into a taxicab and telling the driver that I would like, please, to talk with Fidel Castro.

When I admitted that I had no idea where Castro might be found, the driver pulled up to the curb and consulted some men who were chatting together. They advised me to ask directions at the main police station. There the matter was discussed again in an astonishingly informal fashion. I was advised to apply for an interview at the INEA building where, after explaining something of my purpose before a casual jumble of reception desks, I was suddenly taken in tow

by a stranger who turned out to be an engineer, there this day to submit a rural electrification project to the government. Overhearing my explanations, he had decided that I had "good feelings" and so took it upon himself to steer me to the appropriate officials. It was not, of course, as easy as all that. The men in question were naturally busy. But I was asked to come back again; and the difficulty of getting to see Castro was explained to me in the simplest human terms: he'd been up working, the night before, until 5 a.m. Meanwhile the engineer led me off to meet some other people, of the press and radio, who might be able to arrange the interview for me.

It should be apparent to the reader by now that one widespread impression among us is mistaken: Cubans may be loudly critical of the present policy of our government, but they are not hostile toward the American people. Nor is their friendliness simply the friendliness of a people who want tourists. It is quite unstrained. No Cuban with whom I spoke treated with scorn my determination to try to see Castro. And when I finally did manage an interview in the manner that a number of people had begun to suggest—by catching his eye in a public place and asking whether I could talk with him—the attitude of the small crowd that soon surrounded us was curiously protective. After Castro left, many of them stayed round me for an hour more—asking me about myself and elaborating upon the words he had spoken.

The specific event that had caused me to prolong my stay in Cuba was the speech Castro made on March 6 at the funeral for the men killed in the explosion of the munitions ship, *La Coubre*. He had declared that he couldn't help suspecting that those who had tried to halt all shipments of arms to Cuba (which is to say, U.S. officials) were somehow responsible. His words had filled me with confusion. Back home, I had seen him described in public print as a little dictator in the making. But the vision of him in this role had been dissolved for me by then—confronted as I was by a population enthusiastic, yet without fanaticism. From one person after another I had heard, in effect, the same words: "For the first time we are full of hopes, we feel that life is possible." Even those few people with whom I had talked who were critical of Castro acknowledged that he was helping the great majority and that his regime was absolutely honest. A taxi driver who was furious at him, because he, the driver, depended on tourists for a living—"And they're not coming, they're not coming!" and Castro was to blame—described him, in his wrath, in these terms: "This island has always been called a paradise. Now he wants to actually make it one. He wants to make it a golden saucer, a golden saucer." (I told the cabbie I had never heard that expression. "It's my own," he said proudly.) The day of the funeral speech, however, revived in me the old doubts. Why should Castro mouth such suspicions—even while he admitted that he had no proof?

I had not been staying in Havana itself up to now, but now I moved in, and my second night there I suddenly had a chance to voice the objections of an American to Castro's charges. I wandered by chance into a crowd of people on the Prado who were being solicited for contributions for arms for Cuba. Everyone who donated something was allowed to speak a few words into a microphone, and a TV camera mounted on a truck would catch his picture for watchers throughout Cuba. Still troubled by my doubts, I hesitated to make my own contribution, but the eager faces of the girls asking for donations made my hesitation seem foolish, and I gave a few pesos. Instantly a number of people standing in line to take

their turns at the microphone, waved and smiled at me. "You are an American? That's wonderful. Thank you, thank you!"—and all beckoned to me to say something too. One after another of these people was crying a little speech into the microphone. Even little children squeaked out something with no shyness. (Fiery oratory, I noticed, is a national habit here.) I instinctively shook my head as they invited me to say my word. Then I decided that if I had a protest to make, I should make it here. So I asked the man who was passing the microphone whether he could translate for me, and I said: "Here's to Fidel Castro, and here's to your revolution. But may Castro come to speak less violently against the United States, and it may yet change its heart toward him." I rather expected my words to be disliked, but when I looked about me, people waved at me and cried again "Thank you!" and the next day, when I went to the Western Union office to send a cable, the head of the office hurried toward me, beaming, hand outstretched: "I want to thank you for your cooperation with the Cuban people. If I am not mistaken, I saw you on television last night."

That night, too, I began methodically to ask everyone I found who could speak English: Why did Castro make such violent charges? I had started asking this question on the day he made the speech, and the first answer I had been given had seemed strange to me. "Don't you see? He was so hurt," a young woman had explained to me. It had seemed strange to hear the statements of a head of state explained in such personal terms. And, I told her, most Americans felt that, in the face of Castro's abuse of us, our Government had behaved with astonishing restraint. In the coming days, however, I was to hear repeatedly the same expression, "You must understand, he was hurt," and to mark a look of wonder that I could not appreciate that human fact. Over these next 2 weeks—while I persisted, too, in my attempt to manage a conversation with Castro himself—I had long conversations about the relations between our two countries with scores of Cubans from all walks of life.

They would usually speak first of the refusal of our Government to sell Cuba arms, and of the strong pressure we had put on other governments to refuse them also. "Why are we not to be allowed to defend ourselves?" they would ask. Then they would bring up the raids over Cuba by planes flying from airfields in Florida. There was not a day, I was told, when at least one plane did not come over. Many acres of sugarcane had been destroyed by fire bombs "and sugar is our livelihood"; sugar mills had been attacked; even 100-pound bombs had been dropped; and a raid on Havana on October 21 had caused the death of 2 people, the wounding of almost 50. The United States did little to prevent these flights. I assured them: Our Government naturally deplored the raids, but it wasn't easy to prevent them. How was one to keep a pilot from lying about his destination? Again the response was a look at me and a smile—as though I were a child. If planes had been making similar raids into Canada, they said, they couldn't help feeling that the U.S. Government would have managed by now to stop them.

Everyone with whom I spoke would bring up the subject of the Batista henchmen to whom we allow asylum: Ventura, Laurente, Masferrer, Pedraza, others. These are not political refugees, they would say; they are known mass killers and sadists. There is a gesture in Cuba where the speaker touches the corner of his eye, meaning: I have seen it. This gesture was repeated for me many times. There is scarcely a person to whom

one speaks whose family has been untouched by Batista's torturers. About 19,000 Cubans were murdered by them. In Havana alone, they castrated 300 men and boys, so people said. Some of the tortures they perfected are almost unspeakable. One woman told me with emotion of the treatment dealt out to her cousin. A Batista henchman had had a man jump up and down on the boy's stomach until everything inside him was broken. The fellow responsible "is now a leader of the anti-Communists in Miami," the woman told me. "There is your anti-Communist man. You must try to understand why we are so hurt."

When the Batista men were mentioned, I would urge the difficulties of forbidding asylum. And it was through a mistake, I would point out, that Pedraza had been allowed to enter the country. No such mistakes seemed to occur, they pointed out, when anyone tried to enter whom the United States had named a Communist. And the United States knew, they all said, that Batista's men were not idle there. Men known to be plotting against, say, the Government of England, would never be given such freedom.

It seemed unreal to all these people that we should be indifferent to the nature of these men now in our midst; and it seemed unreal, too, that we should be indifferent to the contrast between the Batista regime and the regime now. That contrast is for them a cause, still, of happy wonder. Person after person would remark to me how amazing it was to be able to look at a soldier or a policeman without fear. And in their eyes the youth I saw drilling in the streets have a very different significance than for the casual visitor. As one of the Catholic priests with whom I talked explained to me with feeling: Army barracks are being converted into schools all over the island. (This is one of the changes people talk most about.) And the militia that one sees everywhere is voluntary—"the first completely voluntary army in history," the priest boasted. "The army can no longer threaten the people of Cuba. The people of Cuba are the army."

It is not only the disappearance of terrorism that they speak of with wonder. Terrorism under Batista was matched by corruption. The facts of this, too, are vivid in every mind. Over and over someone would name for me the exact figures of some monstrous example of graft. Under Batista, a social worker told me, it used to be that a man would go into the government and within 6 months you could count on his being a millionaire. It was something strange, she said, if this didn't happen. One of the first things the heads of the present government did was to reduce their own salaries. Pride in this new honesty is one of the most conspicuous elements in the revolutionary movement. A man pointed out to me the little boxes being passed about for contributions for arms. "And nobody touches a penny," he cried; "this is holy." A girl opened one of the boxes to show me a diamond ring among the pesos contributed.

And so they look about with pride and relief at the difference between the two regimes, and cannot understand why we are suddenly full of protests about this one. They all conclude that the United States does not want Cuba to be independent; that it wants her to remain in the position of a colony.

By now I knew to what they referred when they explained Castro's words about the United States in terms of "hurt." It still seemed to me a strange explanation. Did they not expect diplomacy of their Prime Minister? When I finally did, by chance,

late one afternoon, catch sight of him standing on the sidewalk outside the Sevilla Biltmore Hotel, I stepped up to him and asked my questions directly of him.

I introduced myself as an American distressed at the poor relations existing between our two countries. I did understand, I told him, that he had cause for bitterness; but, I said, his angry words were losing him friends in the United States—even those who might well be his friends. For several minutes his answers to me were a prolonged echo of all I had been hearing from other Cubans. "How would you feel—?" he asked me, and again: "How would you feel—?" naming again for me all the damaging acts, or omission of acts, that had been named for me by one person after another. "How would you feel?" His hand touched my arm. His appeal to me was personal—quite as though I had been trying, say, to reconcile him to a mutual friend who had disappointed him.

I reiterated: I understood why he was bitter. But wasn't he letting bitterness confuse his own actions now—when he went so far as to accuse the United States of complicity in the munitions-ship explosion, of actual crime? He was quick to deny this: he had not accused them. "The people around me, advising me, would never have let me say such a thing. I said that I had no proof. But," he added, "I have a right to wonder." A right to wonder out loud? I asked. The point was, he tried to explain, that if the United States had not attempted so persistently to block all sale of arms to Cuba, such a thing could never have happened. U.S. hostility had created an atmosphere in which the crime was possible.

I told him that I had recently read the speech he had made in October 1953, before the court which tried him for his early rebellion against Batista. (This speech, published under the title "History Will Absolve Me," I recommend to anyone wishing to make a considered judgment of Castro.) He said that I had often heard Americans worry that the might be a potential Mussolini or Hitler; I had decided that one who spoke as he did in that speech never could become another such figure. But listening to his words at the funeral, I had not been sure. Again, he looked at me hard.

The crowd had pressed us close together by now, and someone behind me was holding onto my waist, with warm hands, as though I were a child she or he were helping to speak up. It seemed to me, I said, that in his fight against Batista, his genius had been to win new adherents to his cause from the ranks of the opposition. That is how his army had grown. And in a recent talk to schoolchildren, I reminded him, he had urged the children, in their dealings with the children of those who spoke against the revolution, to "win them over with friendliness, not with contempt." Was he not forgetting that principle in his dealings with the United States?

In the beginning, he answered me now with emphasis, he had done just this—had tried to ask for understanding. But how was he to hope to reach the people of the United States, he asked, when between him and the American people was the American press? He spoke with a hopelessness conspicuously sincere. I persisted: it was not impossible to communicate with the American people. Must he not continue to try to make himself clear—thinking always, when he spoke, of those Americans who could understand him? He had gone on trying for a long time, he said. I asked, must he not keep on trying still? He looked at me then and shrugged his shoulders forward eloquently, "You would like me to be like Christ," he said. I answered: "I would like you to be like Gandhi in his conversations



with the British." "The people of Cuba are like Gandhi," he answered quickly.

I had referred once more to his funeral speech, when he suddenly put his hand on my arm again: "Don't you see? It is not to the United States that I am talking. I am talking to the people of Cuba." He spoke now at length and with feeling: "Don't you understand? I have to build up in the Cuban people a national conscience. I have to teach them what their true situation is. I have to make them aware of what lies before them, to be done and to be suffered. How did George Washington have to speak to his soldiers at Valley Forge?"

He was elaborating upon this theme when two NBC men, who had found their way through the crowd, asked him if he would grant them a televised interview the next day. He tried at first to decline; he was terribly busy; also, he spoke awkward English, and he might not say things well. I asked whether there couldn't be a chance for him to see the interview played back first, before approving it. Impossible, the reporter said, shortly. Castro turned to me suddenly now and patted me on the shoulder: "She's a good girl. She advises me not to get angry."

The newsmen then, pencils in hand, began to ask some of their own questions. The revolution, Castro tried to explain, was not really against the interests of the American people. It was true that a very small group of them would lose something. "We can't help this," he said. "You had a revolution once. There were changes, weren't there? And didn't the British lose something?" "We're reporters," said the NBC man. "We're here to ask you questions." Castro looked surprised. But he went on: The revolution was hurting the interests of a small group of monopolists. "Are you against monopolists?" asked the newsmen quickly. "I'm not against!" Castro cried, with a helpless emphatic gesture: "I am for the Cuban people." (I noted that this outcry was omitted from the account of the interview in next morning's Havana Post, an English-speaking publication there.) "We are in favor of the Cuban people. We are against those who are not," he was simply reported as saying. Nor was there any account of what had been, for me, the heart of his self-explanation: His comparison of his own role to that of Washington at Valley Forge.

I came to believe that afternoon that Castro's words are not really weighed in terms of a reaction to them in the United States. I came to realize also that his very lack of diplomacy in speech, so disastrous where the relations between our two countries were concerned, had for his Cuban audience a special value. "Would you want him to be a hypocrite?" people had been asking me all these days. Batista had indeed been a "good politician," quite able to keep his mouth shut when it was diplomatic to do so. With Castro, Cubans feel secure in the knowledge that whatever comes into his head, he will say. When this leads to some exaggeration, they make allowances: "Remember, he is young." The point is: He is not trying to keep anything back from them. They feel that they share, for the first time, in what is going on. An edge of pride is no doubt involved, too. As the French wife of an exiled Haitian newsmen said, with delight: "They have had to speak carefully for so long. This is an important moment for them."

#### THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a picture that appeared in the Washington Post of President Eisenhower saying goodbye to his little grandson at a Washington airport. In the picture are Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, Homer Gruenther, assistant to the President, Mary Jean and Barbara Ann Eisenhower, granddaughters of the President, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and Mrs. Herter, wife of the Secretary of State.

You see it is a very moving picture. You can just see him saying goodbye and telling his grandson to be a good soldier. That, of course, is what the President was when he started off on his extremely dangerous trip to foreign countries where there are inhospitable groups with vicious threats against him awaiting him. I know he was telling David to be brave and a good soldier, because that is what he has been always. He told his little grandson he would then be acting as the head of the family, since his mother and father, Colonel Eisenhower, the President's son, were going with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a letter addressed to the President by the American Legion Auxiliary, department of Massachusetts. It reads as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,  
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,  
Boston, Mass., June 7, 1960.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,  
President of the United States,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the 41st annual department convention of the Massachusetts American Legion Auxiliary held at New Ocean House, Swampscott, on June 3, it was unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the dignity, patience, and understanding of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, during and subsequent to the ill-fated summit conference, has impressed us with his sincere desire for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas he has been subjected to indignity uncalled for in his position as President of the United States of America: Be it

*Resolved*, That we express to the President our faith in his efforts and our admiration of his report to the Nation."

May we assure you of the love and devotion of 25,000 members of the Massachusetts department during the trying days you spent in Paris and may you be given the health and strength under God's guidance to meet the grave responsibilities which lie ahead.

Cordially yours,

ADELAIDE L. FITZGERALD,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fine resolution. It is entirely nonpartisan, and there are probably more Democrats than Republicans. I rejoice in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I deplore that there are those today in this country who criticize the President of the United States. It is terribly belittling of them, instead of resenting with all their being the attacks by Khrushchev on the President of the United States, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is our symbol of our country—he is our President. And in insulting him they insult the United States. No red-blooded, strong, loyal American, I

think, can criticize the President or find excuses for Khrushchev. There is no red-blooded, strong, loyal American who should not stand up for the integrity and honor and respect due to the United States of America.

#### REPORTING EXPENSES BY HOUSE MEMBERS

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], a member of the House Administration Committee, and a public accountant, introduced a bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress.

The bill deals with an area where we have long needed reform. I am today introducing an identical bill to that of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and I trust the House will move rapidly ahead to tighten up in this area.

#### LITHUANIANS AND THEIR FATE IN 1940

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people have had more than their share of misfortune and misery in their modern history, but the fate that was theirs in June of 1940 proved to be truly tragic. These robust and stout-hearted fighters for freedom had suffered under the oppressive Czarist regime of Russia for more than 100 years, and had regained their independence at the end of the First World War. Thenceforth, for about two decades, they were happy in their homeland, and in that relatively short time they had made Lithuania a model democracy in north-eastern Europe. On the eve of the last war helpless Lithuanians were in a precarious position; they were not strong enough to defend themselves against their arch enemy, the Soviet regime. Soon after the outbreak of the war, Lithuania was attacked, overrun, and occupied by the Red army, and then the country became part of the Soviet Union. In attaining their goal, Soviet authorities resorted to some outrageous and inhuman methods. They deported all

able-bodied men whom they suspected of opposing Communist dictatorship and enslaved the rest of the population.

Even now it is impossible to say how many hundreds of thousands were uprooted from their native Lithuania and, in a mass deportation unprecedented in modern history, were driven to distant parts of the Soviet Union. On this day, 20 years after their deportation, we commemorate that day as one of misfortune and pray for those who died in some desolate part of the Soviet Union.

#### THE HONORABLE MRS. GRACIE PFOST

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Probst] on her overwhelming renomination to the Congress of the United States. She is a great and able Member of the Congress and a very loyal friend and loyal American. She is always very fair to Members on the Republican side as well as Members on the Democratic side. She sincerely wants to be helpful and just.

I know we in Massachusetts are deeply grateful to her. She has aided us in the passage of meritorious legislation in Massachusetts and in my own congressional district. She does this for both sides of the aisle, regardless of party, because she is dedicated to the proper development of this great country of ours. She is a great stateswoman and a great American. The Democrats can be extremely proud of her; I know I am, as a Republican. She is fortunate to have a fine husband who has great pride in her achievements and is constantly by her side, helping her in every possible way. I hope the citizens of Idaho appreciate her many talents, and her fairness in the great legislative job she is doing in the Congress.

Mrs. PFOST. I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Those kind words coming from our dean of the women in the House of Representatives mean much to me. She has been a Member of this distinguished body for more than 35 years. She has served the people of her district faithfully and well. We, who know her, love her. I am gratified to be the recipient of her generous remarks.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN) for today, June 15, 1960, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. MULTER, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:)

Mr. CANFIELD.

Mr. DOOLEY.

(At the request of Mrs. Probst and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. ALFORD.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 10000. An act to amend further certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected;

H.R. 10183. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10684. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10761. An act to provide for the representation of indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1185. An act to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam;

S. 1358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2327. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 2954. An act to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations;

S. 2439. An act to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes certain periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers for educational purposes; and

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish an objective for coordinating the development of the District of Columbia with the

development of other areas in the Washington metropolitan region and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2266. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) negotiated fixed-price contract AT(05-1)-36 with the Union Carbide Nuclear Co. (Carbide), Uravan, Colo., for the procurement of uranium concentrates, December 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2267. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to furnishing reports of additional facts in numerous cases involving the provisions of section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2269. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a juvenile division within or in connection with the District of Columbia Youth Correctional Center, and to authorize the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia to commit to such juvenile division, subject to the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act, children 15 years of age or older"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12483. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; without amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12552. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9600. A bill to authorize



and direct the transfer of certain personal property to State and county agencies engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work; without amendment (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7593. A bill to amend sections 101 and 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 11499. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12273. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12604. A bill to amend the "antikickback statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9079. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11486. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Mina and Henek Szalder; with amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9960. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10376. A bill for the relief of Adolf B. Jochnick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9042. A bill for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12653. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 12654. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 12655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 12656. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 12657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12658. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 12659. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12660. A bill relating to the application of the excise tax on club dues to amounts paid for certain capital improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12661. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12662. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit any person, partnership, or corporation from disseminating advertisements falsely representing the prices at which commodities are offered for sale to be the wholesale prices of such commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 12663. A bill to preserve the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees in certain cases involving reductions in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 12664. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 12665. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and

functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12667. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12668. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act by adding certain requirements with respect to low-rent housing projects in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12669. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with each of the States, Commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia to provide for a private, voluntary medical care insurance program for certain persons over the age of 65, and to authorize payments by the Secretary to States to cover part of the costs of such insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12671. A bill to change the definition of a nonqualified corporation, with respect to the allowance of 8-year carryovers of operations losses in computing the income taxes of new life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12672. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 12673. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported wines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 12674. A bill to require full disclosure of expenditures of Government and counterpart funds by Members of Congress traveling in overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 12675. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 12676. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 12677. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide

coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the Act of \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12678. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 12679. A bill for the relief of George Sauter also known as Georgios Makkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12680. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Baril; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 12681. A bill for the relief of Manfull Dairy Farm, Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 12682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stavros N. Nicolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12683. A bill for the relief of Mr. Earl H. Pendell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

494. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association in support of the Keating-Celler bill with regard to admissible wiretap evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

495. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of 203 citizens of the 32d Congressional District of New York urging speedy enactment of H.R. 4700, the so-called Forand bill, providing health insurance and other benefits for persons eligible under the old age and survivors insurance benefit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### Federal Employees' Pay Increase Legislation

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I manifested my support of the Federal employees' pay increase legislation by signing the discharge petition some time ago. While I do not favor the discharge petition method of operation in the Congress, I think the situation was urgent enough in this case to warrant this procedure.

My interest in the legislation was motivated largely by reason of the fact that the postal workers in my area, at all levels, are receiving inadequate compensation for the job they do, particularly in the light of today's high cost of living and the depreciated value of the dollar.

The postal workers are among the most loyal of our Government employees. They perform arduous and trying tasks with great patience and skill. They are devoted to their jobs and to the Government which they serve. It is incumbent upon that Government, our Government, to see to it that they are properly compensated so that their families can live in reasonable comfort and not have to be harassed by the vexations of penury.

I know of cases where postal workers are working at two jobs in order to keep their households together, feed their families, and educate their children.

Fine men though they are, they are limited in their opportunities for financial growth because of the peculiar nature of their field of activity. The postal workers' one source of relief is in the hands of the Congress.

I am delighted that the motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 324 to 94 and that the motion to pass the measure finally was carried by such a convincing margin.

I would have voted for a 9-percent increase, but the Post Office committee

thought it more equitable to reduce the amount to 7½ percent across the board.

Not only postal workers but all Federal employees will benefit by this measure if it becomes a law, and my feeling is that that is as it should be. Federal workers should be compensated at a rate comparable to that in private industry.

#### Mr. Jozsef Kovago

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting Mr. Jozsef Kovago when he came to my district to speak under the auspices of Crusade for Freedom last month. Twice the freely elected mayor of Budapest, Mr. Kovago deeply impressed me and all those who were privileged to see and hear him.

I understand that this longtime fighter for democracy, who now resides in Wilmington, Del., will address the Federation of Women's Clubs tomorrow in the Sheraton Park Hotel here.

From my experience at Camp Kilmer in 1957 when the Hungarian refugees came to our shores, I know and will never forget the suffering they endured and the depth of their dedication to democracy. Mr. Kovago was a leader of these people. Last year he wrote a moving book about his struggles called "You Are All Alone."

That book recounts the story of Hungary from 1950 through the noble revolution of 1956, and it is at the same time the personal biography of Mr. Kovago. For more than 6 years this patriot suffered the agonies of imprisonment by the Communists—and he did not break. Released just before the outbreak of the revolution, he again placed himself in danger by working for the establishment of a multiparty system. On November 1, 1956, he was elected mayor of Budapest—the second time he had held the office—and 4 days later Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest and the revolution was crushed.

With his wife and daughter, Mr. Kovago escaped to Austria.

In the years that have followed Mr. Kovago has become a leading spokesman for Hungary's case. He has told an eloquent story of his shackled, freedom-loving country in his book, in the United States and Europe, and before the United Nations.

#### One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of the Admission of Arkansas Into the Union

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 124th anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. On June 15, 1836, Arkansas became the 25th State. It is fitting indeed that we should pause and recognize this anniversary, for Arkansas has indeed been hailed as one of the outstanding States of this country.

Rich in heritage, Arkansas was first visited by the early European explorers in 1541 when Hernando de Soto crossed the Mississippi River and entered the Arkansas country. This early expedition occurred approximately a half century after America was first visited by Columbus.

Other explorers who followed de Soto were Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet. Then on April 9, 1682, Robert Caveleir, Sieur de la Salle claimed all the land drained by the Mississippi River for France. Henri de Tonti established Arkansas Post in 1686 and this became the oldest permanent white settlement west of the Mississippi. De Tonti has often been called the Father of Arkansas.

After Arkansas was admitted to the Union 124 years ago today, the State government was housed in the Old State House which now stands as one of the outstanding examples of Old South antebellum architecture. In the Old State House one finds one of the finest existing State museums, with a record of the var-